

THE QUEST FOR
CATHOLICITY

BX

5129

T3

A Study in Anglicanism

GEORGE H. TAVARD

HERDER AND HERDER

1964

HERDER AND HERDER

232 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N.Y.

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

NIHIL OBSTAT: DANIEL DUIVESTIJN, S.T.D.
CENSOR DEPUTATUS
IMPRIMATUR: ✠ GEORGIUS L. CRAVEN
EPISCOPUS SEBASTOPOLIS
VIC. CAP.
WESTMONASTERII: DIE 21A JUNII 1963

The Nihil obstat and Imprimatur are a declaration that a book or pamphlet is considered to be free from doctrinal or moral error. It is not implied that those who have granted the Nihil obstat and Imprimatur agree with the contents, opinions or statements expressed.



Library of Congress Catalog Card No.: 63-18162

PRINTED IN ENGLAND

CONTENTS

<i>Chap.</i>	<i>Page</i>
PROLOGUE	vii
I. CRANMER AND GARDINER	I
II. THE ELIZABETHAN AGE	22
III. THE CAROLINE DIVINES	44
IV. THE RESTORATION	69
V. THE NON-JURORS	94
VI. EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HIGH-CHURCHMEN	121
VII. THE OXFORD MOVEMENT	148
VIII. ANGLO-CATHOLICISM	179
EPILOGUE	201
SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	209
NOTES	212
INDEX	225

PROLOGUE

THE purpose of this volume is to investigate the notion of Catholicity as it has developed in Anglicanism, from the Reformation to the beginning of the twentieth century. Except in the first chapters, I have included only High Church theology in this study; for a consideration of Low Church Anglicanism would have introduced elements of Protestant origin which would have required a different method of approach. At the outset, therefore, this book may be criticized for not doing justice to all shades of Anglican opinion and for weighting the balance in favour of High-Churchmanship. But this criticism need not be formulated, for I make no other claim than to write a chapter in the history of Anglican thought, knowing that other chapters could be written and hoping that somebody sometime will write them.

It goes without saying that my own concept of Catholicity is that of the Church in communion with the See of St Peter. This will appear from time to time in critical reflections. Yet I do not think the objectivity of my investigation has been threatened by this. It is important for the future of ecumenical conversations to attempt to see other traditions as they are in themselves, as they have been shaped by history and as they are intended to be by those who hold them. That such an effort may be made does not detract from one's commitments and convictions. I believe that Anglicanism, High or Low, Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical, originated in a tragic mistake, or in a series of tragic mistakes, made in the sixteenth century. Yet it is more valuable for the present and the future to assess the results and consequences of it in the Anglican history than endlessly to repeat how tragic the mistake was! In the course of our assessment we may come to note that subsequent history has partially corrected the original mistake. We may also come better to understand the present situation and the possible future of Anglican thought. The ultimate purpose of this work is therefore to contribute to a better climate for Anglican-Catholic relationships

and to a continuing theological conversation between the Anglican communion and what I believe to be simply the Catholic Church.



The treatment of the topic does not quite follow the same lines in all chapters. The material was always ample, but since my investigation was restricted to the concept of Catholicity, I selected the authors who, in each period, seemed best to bring out the main lines of development of a "high" doctrine of Catholicity. Such a choice cannot avoid a certain subjectivity, and others might have balanced the record differently.

For the beginning of the English Reformation, which was a time of feverish activity rather than of serene reflection, I chose Archbishop Cranmer and Bishop Gardiner as the main representatives of conflicting views, which ultimately survived in the two dominant movements of Anglican thought, called, at various times, Low and High, Evangelical and Catholic. In the following chapters I devoted more attention to Gardiner's line or, to be more exact, to the concept of Catholicity which reflected the "highest" doctrine then accepted.

The choice of representative figures for the Restoration led to give special importance to Herbert Thorndike and Henry Dodwell, who are otherwise not the most typical thinkers of the "High-Church Party". Thorndike and Dodwell are nevertheless significant of a "high" conception of Catholicity, and they deserve, I would suggest, more attention than they commonly receive. For the same reason, the Non-Jurors take up the bulk of Chapter V. They were officially no longer in the Establishment; yet their theology, faithful to Anglicanism as they understood it, remained essentially Anglican, even though it was more Catholic than any other as long as the Non-Juring Schism lasted.

Finally, the conclusion ends with remarks on the present situation, the premises of which do not all follow from the story told in the chapters of this book. This seems unavoidable. If I wish to contribute to a dialogue between Anglicans and Roman

Catholics, I cannot hide my own Roman Catholic positions. These must lead to value judgments with which many Anglicans and Protestants will certainly disagree. Yet disagreement should remain friendly. An attempt to renovate a dialogue with Anglicanism implies no detraction from the praiseworthy efforts to keep conversations going with other sections of Christendom.



Acknowledgments are due to the American Council of Learned Societies, which enabled the author, through a travel-grant, to visit libraries in England and Scotland. Much of the material used for Chapter VI was consulted, with the help of this grant, in the following libraries: the British Museum, Lambeth Palace Library, the Bodleian Library, the Scottish National Library, the Library of New College, Edinburgh.

Other libraries have been constantly used and therefore deserve special mention: the libraries of Union Theological Seminary, General Theological Seminary in New York City, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary and Bexley Hall in Ohio.

Chapter One

CRANMER AND GARDINER

Necessity in things absolutely necessary contains in it order, law and authority.—Henry VIII.

WHEN Henry VIII broke with Rome, he did not consider siding with the Continental Reformers. Title-conscious as he was, he did not forget that he was, by official papal acknowledgment, "Defensor of the Faith", the author of one of the best known refutations of Martin Luther. No sooner was it published than his *Assertion of the Seven Sacraments* had become a sharp weapon in the polemical panoply of German Catholics. So it remained after the English schism. The younger Henry, while he coveted the title of *Defensor fidei*, was an ardent papalist. Like many another before him, he could have coloured the primacy of the Bishop of Rome with a hue of conciliarism: the Bishop of Rome is indeed the universal Primate, yet he may be overruled by a General Council in specific instances, especially when the Pope is personally inclined to heretical views. In the 1520's, conciliarism, though definitely on the wane, was still accepted among Catholic churchmen. Sir Thomas More, Henry's adviser, courtier and friend, was on the conciliaristic side. It was his considered advice to Henry that a King ought not to profess too open a papalist attitude. For a shrewd Pope could turn this to his own political advantage. Conflicts of kings and popes had been frequent in history. There had been famous ones in the Holy Empire, in the Kingdom of France and in England itself. But Henry loathed half-measures. He persisted in spite of Thomas More. As More will later testify during his trial, he himself was converted from conciliarism to papalism by Henry's arguments. Once thus convinced, he could not veer again: by persuading More, Henry prepared him for the scaffold.

However this may have been, Henry endeavoured to justify his schism from Rome theologically. An official explanation, supported if possible by recourse to Canon Law and to theological tradition, would help those of his subjects who had a theological mind, to accept, sincerely or not, the break. It would also better the international position of England. For the other Catholic kings would take due account of it. Finally Henry needed it also, or at least we may so presume, to appease his conscience.)

The solution was not far to seek. The epic clash between the Popes of Rome and the Emperors of the Holy Roman Empire had hinged around diverging conceptions of Christian authority. When Charlemagne revived the notion of a Western Empire, he recognized the total spiritual supremacy of the Bishop of Rome: the Emperor was the God-given protector of the Church. But the relations of spiritual and secular authority did not continue harmonious in the following centuries. Canon lawyers were not of one mind. For some of them, the Pope enjoyed, by Christ's authority, total jurisdiction in temporal as well as in spiritual matters. The temporal part of it was only loaned to the Emperor in return for a pledge to protect the Church and put his might at her service. For others, the Pope had only spiritual authority; secular power came directly from Christ. The old Roman Law was a tool of tremendous potentiality in the hands of this party, as it bestowed on the Emperor a quasi-divine halo. (For one party, the Pope created the Emperor. For the other, Emperor and Pope were equals, who ruled different realms. From the latter, it was easy to make headway towards a more advanced position: the spiritual authority of the popes and the bishops becomes law through imperial intervention. For while the Pope embodies the priesthood of Christ, the Emperor has inherited his kingship. Each of these incarnates one aspect of Christ's office. Their complementary functions in the body of Christendom are of equal necessity.)

Henry's task was simple: he could revive the latter sort of theology and take over the legal aspect of spiritual authority. To this end, he hit on the bold claim that he was not only King,

but, within the realm of England, Emperor. His anti-papal decrees started in fact with a declaration of the King of England's imperial authority.)

The Court-inspired Petition of the Commons of 1532, which asked for a royal rebuke of the bishops' handling of affairs on twelve counts, was couched in conventional language(1). The Act in Restraint of Appeals, of 1533, however, called a new tune. It began with a statement of principles which sounds as bold as it seems embarrassed:

Where by divers sundry old authentic histories and chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that *this realm of England is one Empire*, and so has been accepted by the world, governed by one supreme Head and King having the dignity and royal estate of *the imperial crown of the same*, unto whom a body politic, compact of all sorts and degrees of people divided in terms and by names of spirituality and temporalty, be bound and ought to bear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience . . .(2).

This expresses the legal basis for Henry's intervention in "that part of the said body politic called the spirituality, now being usually called the English Church"(3). Bold as this is in its newness, it is made not a little awkward by that vague reference to "divers sundry old authentic histories", as though a cascade of adjectives could conjure up those mysterious and unspecified documents. Yet, as a politician, Henry VIII was satisfied that he was covered by a face-saving device.

So important was this official jargon that it will be used under Elizabeth in the second separation of the English spirituality from Rome. As formulated by the Commons, the Act of Supremacy of 1559 noted: "... in the time of the reign of your most dear father of worthy memory, King Henry VIII, divers good laws and statutes were made and established . . . for the restoring and uniting to *the imperial crown of this realm* the ancient jurisdictions . . ."(4).

In the meantime, ruin had befallen some of the original supporters of the claim. When Archbishop Cranmer was sent to the Tower under Queen Mary, this concept of royal-imperial

authority rebounded. In a dignified letter to the Queen in September 1555, Cranmer enjoined her not to restore Papal Supremacy. For, as he wrote, "the Imperial Crown and jurisdiction temporal of this realm is taken immediately from God to be used under Him only, and is subject unto none but to God alone"(5). But what can be done when the holder of the Crown insists on receiving it from the Pope of Rome? This is a case where Cranmer was more royalist than the Queen.

The concept of imperial authority had been born in the Catholic mind of medieval lawyers. It was originally intended to ensure the brotherly collaboration of Pope and Emperor. It tried to cement their joint authority as inseparably as the qualities of Kingship and Priesthood were, in Christ, at one. Its aim was to guarantee the universality of the faith, the identity of the Church and the Christian dominions. This implied a strictly Catholic view of faith: the Church is the "whole", of which Christian kingdoms form the temporal facets.

In the law courts of Henry VIII, the same concept effectively separated what it formerly kept together. Yet Henry, self-styled Emperor within his kingdom, tried to preserve the implicitly Catholic contents of the theory that he used. If he now rejected the Pope's spiritual primacy, he preserved the identity of Church and Kingdom. At this point, he needed to return to the conciliarism which his work on Luther had condemned. Spiritual authority, in the Henrician Church, is not exactly vested in the King himself. As *The King's Book* made clear, it rests in the bishops of the Realm. Cranmer himself recognized this in his most earnest moments. He thus declared during his trial: "Christ is the only Head of his Church and of the faith and religion of the same. The King is head and governor of his people, which are the visible Church. . . . There was never other thing meant"(6).

The former collaboration between the Emperor and the Pope must now give place to a friendly co-operation of the English bishops and the English King. There is, however, a significant difference: the King has more than the authority for making doctrine into law. In virtue of his "Royal Supremacy" he does more than give legal value to what the bishops have decided in

their spiritual domain. For Henry does not fully trust their orthodoxy. As Defensor of the Faith, he intervenes in spiritual matters. If the English bishops had misgivings on this point, they were soon enlightened. Their own *Bishops' Book*, published in 1539 without the King's endorsement, was replaced in 1543 by a royal version of it, *The King's Book*. In this, Henry corrected in a Catholic sense the more radical positions of his archbishop.)

In the Henrician implications of the word, Catholicity is manifested in this co-extension of Church and State. By its official status Henry's Church was in continuity with the universal Church of preceding ages, even though this status rested on what had become, in the Church universal, a minority conception of authority. Given these premises, it is clear that Henry could not consistently brook any change in doctrinal orthodoxy. In the first place, his own faith was persistently Catholic. In the second, to ban formulations of faith which were authoritative before the rejection of Papal Supremacy, would amount to condemning the Church to which Henry's Church claimed succession. This would in turn wreck the entire justification of the break with Rome. For it would ultimately destroy the very concept of Emperorship which Henry had inherited from the Catholic past.

(The bishops, like Cranmer, who from time to time attempted a reformation of the Church in a Protestant sense, showed little understanding of the point of law on which Henry took his stand when he repelled papal jurisdiction. The Royal Supremacy marked a return to a theory of spiritual authority which was, by then, antiquated, yet of Catholic parentage. Henry was familiar enough with the theological mind to know that the theory would not hold water long if it were cut off from the Catholic realities of faith, worship and ethics out of which it had arisen.)



Catholicity cannot be defined only in terms of State-Church relations. (In terms of doctrine, Henry's Catholicism remained what it had always been, minus the Papal Supremacy. But this is where the bishops of England were not all in agreement.)

(The outstanding champion of doctrinal Catholicity was Stephen

Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.) A trained lawyer, Gardiner was also a theologian of value. He opposed the schism until it was consummated. He then accepted the Royal Supremacy, which he even attempted to justify in his *De Vera Obedientia* (1535). He went as far as writing a distasteful pamphlet in approval of the death of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who died on the scaffold for refusing the Royal Supremacy. In this instance Gardiner displayed a servility to Henry which does not honour him.

Yet Gardiner did not lack courage. Nor did he ever turn into a fanatic anti-papist. (During the ill-fated Pilgrimage of Grace in 1537 he advised Henry to restore papal jurisdiction. At the Regensburg Diet in 1541, as Ambassador to the Emperor, he made overtures to Bishop Granvella on the possibility of a reconciliation of England with Rome, and he may have received a letter from the Pope on this subject. This he could not have done if he had been completely won over to schism, and, we may presume, if he had known Henry to be utterly unamenable to a reconciliation.)

The See of Winchester was, in practice, the second of the Kingdom. Its importance in the ecclesiastical politics of England in the sixteenth century ranked next after that of Canterbury. Cranmer was aware of this. He also knew Gardiner's Catholic convictions. He therefore tried to neutralize the Bishop of Winchester. Cranmer's attempts to sway the King to the Protestant side appear to have been carefully timed. *The Bishops' Book* was composed and issued while Gardiner was away on an embassy to the Court of France. This infuriated Gardiner all the more as his signature had been, unknown to himself, appended to the book. To Henry he immediately protested that he was not responsible for such a production. (Writing to Cranmer himself in July 1547, Gardiner did not mince words about *The Bishops' Book*.) He likened it to a well that "had water enough in it to serve us and Germany also, for both parties, as Your Grace speaks, and the third part, for a need. It resembled a common storehouse, where everyman laid up in store such ware as he liked, and could tell where to find to serve his purpose", a description which could

fit other Anglican productions since then. Gardiner pointedly added: "In the Civil Law we have sometime Homer's verses brought in for proof of two contrary sentences"(7).

(The publication of the Ten Articles, marked by doctrinal ambiguity, and the destruction of the shrines both took place in 1536, while Gardiner was perforce abroad in the royal service. Later, during the reign of Edward VI, Cranmer would work in peace on the Book of Common Prayer. For his adversary Gardiner was conveniently incarcerated in the Tower, vainly waiting for an indictment.)

In purely doctrinal matters that were free of political expediency, the Bishop of Winchester was adamant. He would not move from Catholic orthodoxy as defined before the break with Rome. His criterion was universality of belief, joined to consonancy with Scripture and the constant Church tradition. "A Catholic faith", he declared, "is a universal faith taught and preached through all [ages] and so received and believed agreeably and consonant to the Scriptures, testified by such as in all ages have in their writings given knowledge thereof, which be the tokens and marks of a true Catholic faith"(8). Every Protestant innovation he branded as subversive of Church and society. Because "it is hard to know God throughly, but impossible to express God in language"(9), no wise man, Gardiner maintained, should trust his own judgment in matters of faith. Rather one should humbly profess "the Catholic doctrine now received"(10). Any other attitude would foment chaos. As Gardiner wrote to Cranmer in 1547, "If the wall of authority which I accounted established . . . be once broken and new water let in at a little gap, the vehemency of novelty will flow farther than your Grace will admit"(11).

(Opposing Gardiner at every turn, Archbishop Thomas Cranmer held a very different conception of Catholicity. His own view of the Eucharist was, he asserted, the "true and Catholic doctrine"(12). At which Gardiner marvelled that a doctrine could be entitled Catholic which had been held by no more than half a dozen persons before Cranmer adopted it(13).)

Cranmer could reply by appealing to his own interpretation

of Christian antiquity. As he understood the Fathers of the first centuries, they shared the Protestant doctrine on the Sacrament of the Altar. Here lay the difference between the two conceptions. For Gardiner, a doctrine was Catholic if it was held by the present Church, in continuity with the early Church. For Cranmer, it was Catholic if it was held by the early Church, even in opposition to the present Church. Gardiner took it for granted that Catholic truth never could be lost. The Protestants were misled in that they rejected part of this Catholic truth. Cranmer, on the contrary, was convinced that truth had petered away in the Church. The Reformers were right because they had prophetically recovered it.

Both appealed to Scripture with equal devotion. Yet Gardiner would not read Scripture against the common consent of the Church at any period of her history. Cranmer would find a wonderful agreement between the Church and Scripture in the first five or six centuries, over against the subsequent Church, poisoned, as he thought, by the Bishops of Rome. In the former case, Catholicity is a fidelity to the totality of the militant Church, which cannot be mistaken because she is always protected and guided by the Holy Spirit. In the latter, it is a return to a remote past away from the present and the recent past. In other words, the standard of the Catholic interpretation of Scripture is identified with the present Church no less than with the ancient. Or, at the opposite pole, it is equated only with the early period, supposedly better endowed by the Holy Spirit.

(There lies a basic difficulty in Cranmer's conception. It is one thing to state that the faith of the early centuries was nearer to the scriptural source of doctrine. It is entirely different to surmise at what point the subsequent Church is supposed to have gone astray. Cranmer himself was never quite sure how to do this. His views on the Eucharist varied greatly as his understanding of Scripture changed. This shows well enough that Scripture alone does not offer a stable point of reference: we never know "Scripture alone"; we know it as read through the glasses that we happen to be wearing. Cranmer's spectacles had been imported from the Continent. Germany and Switzerland had wrought

them, and their colour varied as German or Swiss influence prevailed.) As Cranmer read Scripture and the works of the Fathers, he instilled into them conceptions coming from Wittenberg, Geneva or Zurich. (In a way, his standard was neither Scripture nor the early Fathers; it was the Continental Reformation.) Yet (this should be qualified. For Cranmer believed that the Reformers used a valid touchstone of doctrine: primitivity.)

(Primitivity has a double connotation. It refers to age: the primitive doctrine is the oldest, the earliest. It also refers to contents: primitive means simple. Simplicity marks primitivity, the state of things that existed before sophistication adulterated the Gospel. To discover the Gospel one has therefore to follow a solid thread: the Catholic doctrine is the primitive one; and what is primitive is known by its simplicity.)

Cranmer can therefore go ahead: by way of elimination he will reach the ultimate simplicity of the original doctrine. Thus he successively abandoned transubstantiation and the real presence, until he believed only in a spiritual presence to faith on the Zwinglian type of Eucharistic theology. But where to stop once we are launched on such a venture? John Hooper, the Edwardian Bishop of Gloucester, went one step further: in the name of Cranmer's simplicity he rejected the use of liturgical vestments which Cranmer admitted without a qualm.

★

(The first Anglican Church was, then, divided over two concepts of Catholicity, that of Gardiner and that of Cranmer. The latter itself was applied more radically by some extremists of an early Puritan bent than Cranmer cared to do. The two concepts clashed time and time again.) We will examine some revealing episodes of their struggle for supremacy.

Cranmer's claim that the Church of England was returning to primitive simplicity had to face an issue which was evident to the most casual observer. The Continental Reformers always believed that they were restoring pristine purity. Yet neither Lutheran Germany nor the Swiss cantons of Zwingli or Calvin preserved an episcopal structure. England on the contrary, (under Henry

VIII's rule, did not stray from what was hitherto the Catholic hierarchy of Orders: laymen, deacons, priests and bishops. For political motives, Henry and his lay vicar-general for spiritual matters, Thomas Cromwell, restricted the exercise of episcopal authority. Episcopal visitations of English dioceses were suspended in 1534, to be replaced by the royal visitations of 1534 and 1538. This emergency measure ensured the smooth running of Church spoiliations. It entailed no doctrinal doubt concerning the nature of episcopal authority.

Yet one point is clear. Men like Gardiner on the one hand and Cranmer on the other could not justify episcopacy on the same ground. Gardiner and the Catholic party perpetuated the conception of an episcopate established by the Apostles with authority to preside over the Church until the Lord would return. Cranmer could hardly agree with this. The early Church to which he appealed was indeed episcopal. But the Continental Reformers did not consider the biblical basis of episcopacy strong enough to make it essential to the Church. Furthermore, the bishops, since the seventh century, had, to Cranmer's mind, misled the Church. Instead of foiling the tyrannic purpose of the Antichrist of Rome, they had approved it. They had thereby demonstrated that their authority was no longer apostolic. At this point a new theory of episcopacy was needed.)

In 1540 a commission of eight bishops and twelve theologians were ordered to answer a list of seventeen questions concerning the sacraments. Who initiated this is doubtful. The Archbishop, taking full advantage of Gardiner's embassy to Germany, may well have suggested the questions to the King. Or the King, who was then engaged in revising *The Bishops' Book*, may have wanted to test his clerics on a point where they obviously disagreed. Henry was never loath to make a show of being a better theologian than his bishops were.

The least that may be said is that some of the seventeen questions are evidently loaded.

Questions 9 to 14 toy with the idea that consecration of bishops or ordination of priests may be dispensed with in some circumstances. The King wants to know, for instance, if the

Apostles created bishops by divine authority, or only because there was no King then who could make bishops by his own authority (q. 9). He asks if any but a bishop can make a priest (q. 10); if appointment is enough or must be supplemented by consecration (q. 12). He also posits a dilemma: a Christian king, having conquered a pagan land, has neither bishops nor priests with him: does God's law empower him "to make and constitute priests or no"? (q. 13). Also, what can he do, "if it is so fortunèd that all the bishops and priests of a region were dead"? (q. 14).

The situation envisaged is rather fanciful. But it was no joke for those who had to solve the dilemma there and then. The substance of the solutions proposed has fortunately been preserved.

(These solutions may be divided into four groups. Some absolutely rejected all assumption by a layman—be he King or subject—of powers that are reserved to apostolic authority. Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, made this most clear:) "We neither find Scripture, nor example, that will bear that any man, being himself no priest, may make, that is to say, may give the Order of priesthood to another . . . forsomuch as no man may use this or any other authority which comes from the Holy Ghost, unless he have either commission grounded in Scripture, or else authority by tradition and ancient use of Christ's Church universally received over all"(14). (Accordingly, a clergy appointed without episcopal consecration and ordination would forsake all validity. Its authority would be null and void.)

(A second group of answers agrees with this in principle. Yet it adds that the pressure of extreme necessity may suspend ordinary laws.) Dr Roger Edgeworth suggested that the King then "ought to abide and look for a special commission from Almighty God, as Moses had"(15). Dr Coren esteemed that "God would illumine that Prince, so that he himself should be made a Bishop by internal working of God, as Paul was"(16). Should no such mystical commission or consecration take place, the best would be to send for bishops in other countries, "and else not to meddle"(17).

(A third kind of answer is more liberal: necessity binds the

King to act.) This is Dr John Redmayn's opinion: "I think they might in such case of necessity; for in this case the laymen made the whole Church there, and the authority of preaching and ministering the sacraments is given immediately to the Church; and the Church may appoint ministers as is thought convenient" (18). (Henry apparently concurred with this pragmatic view.) For he wrote in the margin of the answers: "Necessity in things absolutely necessary entails in it order, law and authority" (19), a motto which may have served him on more than one occasion. (Finally, the least sacramental answer is given by no other than the Archbishop of Canterbury and, significantly, by him alone: "In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Bishop or a priest needs no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient" (20).) Cranmer adds, somewhat gratuitously, that the concrete dilemma of the Christian King deprived of bishops has already been solved in his own way: "There be histories that witness that some Christian Princes and other laymen un-consecrate have done the same" (21). The Archbishop of York had an easy task denying this claim: history has recorded no such event. But (the significant point here is that Cranmer, alone of all the divines present, completely eliminated the sacramental element of priesthood and episcopacy. This was in keeping with the pointed silence of Cranmer's Thirteen Articles of 1538.) These were prepared (in a conference with German Lutherans) in view of a theological agreement on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. (Article 10 asked for the ministers of the Church to be "duly called" according to the laws and customs of each realm. It said not a word of sacramental ordination and consecration.)

In practice, Cranmer's solution extended the Royal supremacy to a domain which was hitherto sacramental. (A bishop, in his opinion, is not made by his consecration, but by his royal appointment. Consecration is superfluous.) In the light of this one may wonder at Cranmer's refusal to humour Hooper, the Bishop-elect of Gloucester, when he strenuously objected to being consecrated in episcopal vestments. As elected by Edward VI, he was, according to Cranmer's theory, a full bishop before his conse-

cration. The vestment controversy was, then, pointless fuss. If vestments were becoming in an episcopal consecration and Hooper, for conscience's sake, refused to wear them, why consecrate him at all? (At any rate, Cranmer did not dare to apply his own conception of the superfluity of consecration. In spite of this inconsistency of its ecclesiastical champion, this conception became official under King Edward.) On 6th February 1547, the Council, under the presidency of Protector Somerset, decided that the bishops' commission had come to an end with the death of Henry VIII. A formula was then drawn up for the renewal of their "authority of spiritual jurisdiction" (22).

(Stephen Gardiner, who was not yet confined to the Tower, courageously protested: episcopal authority is "ordinary" and not "delegated". In terms of Catholic Canon Law and theology, Gardiner was right.) Within the Cranmerian-Edwardian view of episcopacy, the language of Protector Somerset was logical: if a bishop's authority derives from the King's spiritual jurisdiction, it necessarily ceases with the reign. This had not been Henry's position. Yet it followed from Cranmer's doctrine that "all Christian Princes have committed unto them immediately of God the whole cure of their subjects, as well concerning the administration of God's word, for the cure of soul, as concerning the ministration of things political and civil governance; and in both these ministrations they must have sundry ministers under them to supply that which is appointed to their several offices" (23). This was not exactly the language of Cranmer at his trial. At this period of his life, however, his acts fitted in this theory.

(From a historical standpoint the Cranmerian doctrine of episcopacy is indefensible.) For, among other things, the Church has not always been identical with the Kingdom. If episcopal authority derives from Christian kings, where did it come from before kings became Christian? (Cranmer's theology claims agreement with the first centuries. Yet precisely in those days episcopal authority could not proceed from kings. Has Cranmer adopted a double standard, appealing to the first centuries when it is convenient, and ignoring them at other times?)

(The clearest answer is provided by an anonymous pamphlet

published in 1538(24). This *Treatise concerning General Councils, the Bishops of Rome and the Clergy* upholds the Royal Supremacy while it also favours several Protestant doctrines. It especially rejects the sacrament of penance. The main point of the pamphlet is that Kings only may convene a General Council. Chapter 5 faces the question of authority "before the conversion of Kings". The solution is that the power belonging now to Christian kings was then in the hands of the Apostles and their disciples, acting "in the name of the whole Church". When the Apostles died, power rested with the seniors of the people and was transferred to kings at their conversion. From the end of the first century to the second decade of the fourth, therefore, authority could be vested neither in Apostles nor in kings. The status of the "seniors" or bishops of that period was only, according to our pamphlet, transitory.)

(Cranmer was certainly not the author of this treatise. Whether he himself raised the problem envisaged is not clear. Yet the solution, if it may be called one, lies in the logic of his premises.)

(Authority in the Church, as seen by Cranmer, does not derive from episcopal succession. It comes from the twofold source of the written Word of God and the King's authority. The Protestants under Queen Mary argued that in case of conflict the Gospel must inspire passive resistance to the Royal Supremacy which is supposedly misused. As a result, all will not run smoothly in the Christian Commonwealth of Cranmer. For all and sundry may oppose the King on the basis of their own understanding of the Gospel. Cranmer himself, in his last days, will refuse obedience to Mary in spiritual matters.)

At this juncture, Cranmer's view of Catholicity does not fare well. The "primitive or Catholic Church"(25) is the standard model. For several centuries, and especially in the most primitive Church after the Apostles, this embodiment of orthodoxy had a temporary, even abnormal, structure: it was no longer guided by Apostles and not yet protected by kings. The age of sound doctrine anteceded the age of sound royal organization. Yet, strangely enough, it is that period which remains, second only to Holy Scripture, normative. Conversely, the "accursed synagogue

of Anti-Christ" did not grow when the Church was thus bereft of a visible "Supreme Head". The "malignant and papistical Church of Rome"(26) developed later under the wings of Christian kings, the providential protectors of the Church.)

Shall we accuse Cranmer of inconsistency? No doubt. But we should not accuse him of more than that. Cranmer was inconsistent because he was seeking. And he was seeking what he never found: a way to discover for certain what was "the order of the primitive Church"(27). Cranmer's quest for Catholicity never reached the haven that it was searching for.



The suspicion may arise, as we go through Cranmer's writings, that his standard of Catholicity eventually became more negative than positive. He firmly believed in Scripture as the ultimate rule. He also trusted the primitive Church of the first centuries as having remained faithful to Scripture. Yet (when he had to determine exactly what was the "true and Catholic" doctrine, Cranmer seems to have proceeded by opposition to papal teaching rather than by the unprejudiced uncovering of evidence.) This may not be entirely his fault. He was involved in polemics. Polemicists often think by contrast with their adversary. Yet in the long, heated controversy over the Holy Eucharist, Stephen Gardiner, the defensor of transubstantiation, remained remarkably detached and objective. Thomas Cranmer meanwhile displayed the complex of opposition which is associated with being "anti-" something. x

Once Cranmer had turned anti-Roman, he held at his disposal an unambiguous principle: "The Church of Rome . . . in all doings and teachings so does mix and confound error with truth, superstition with religion, godliness with hypocrisy, Scripture with traditions, that she shows herself always uniform and constant to confound all the doctrine of Christ"(28). Being convinced of this, Cranmer could sharpen another tool. Primitive Catholicity is Christianity freed from what the Bishops of Rome have wickedly added to it. The search for primitivity will

therefore sift out the doctrines of recent accretion. Catholicity will then shine out in its original purity.)

(The chief of these new doctrines is, to Cranmer's mind, transubstantiation.) As the Archbishop of Canterbury saw it, this was a scholastic invention, born in the minds of medieval theologians and imposed on the Church by the Popes. (It needs no saying that this view of the origin of the doctrine of transubstantiation is historically untenable. Though the word *transubstantiatio* is medieval, the concept it covers is patristic. It was clearly formulated, for instance, by St Ambrose of Milan, well within the early period to which Cranmer wanted the Church to return. But Cranmer could only take counsel from what he thought he knew, whether this was, in fact, true or false.) In this matter he felt, at all events, sure of his ground.

Cranmer's *Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Saviour Christ*, and his longer *Answer* to Gardiner's refutation of the *Defense*, refuted the idea that, "in the Supper of the Lord after the words of consecration, as they call it, there is none other substance remaining but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood, so that there remains neither bread to be eaten nor wine to be drunken. . . . And so there remains whiteness but nothing is white; there remains colours but nothing is coloured therewith; there remains roundness but nothing is round . . . and so other qualities and quantities without anything to receive them. And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of our faith" (29). In other words, the Archbishop of Canterbury identifies faith in transubstantiation with acceptance of an Aristotelian explanation of it. Rejecting the one, he then abandons the other with it, not noticing that this is throwing away the baby with the bath water.

The Bishop of Winchester, who wrote at length on transubstantiation, did not vouch for the Aristotelian explanation. This is a search of "how" transubstantiation takes place. Yet, Gardiner maintained, "As we be admonished to leave searching of 'how' of the work of God in the mystery of Christ's presence, being that the celestial part of the sacrament, so not to search of 'how' in the experience of the operation of nature, of the visible part of

the sacrament"(30). (Not the "how" of communion and transubstantiation matters, but the fact. This Gardiner expressed in a most telling manner: "We say Christ's Body to be not locally present, not by manner of quantity, but invisibly and in no sensible manner, but marvellously and in a sacrament and mystery truly, and in such a spiritual manner as we cannot define and determine; and yet by faith we know His Body present"(31).)

Belief is an act of faith, not a philosophical theory. Admittedly, some formulations of transubstantiation are defective because they seem excessively negative. (The formula of the Six Articles of 1539 was well balanced: "That in the most blessed sacrament of the altar, by the strength and efficacy of God's mighty word (it being spoken by the priest), is present really, under the form of bread and wine, the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary; and that after the consecration there remains no substance of bread or wine, nor any other substance, but the substance of Christ, God and man") (32). This can easily be quoted in a truncated form: "There remains no substance of bread and wine". Thus pruned of its positive elements, the doctrine appears negative.

(In good Catholic theology, however, this is not so. Gardiner formulated this point excellently:

It is not said in the doctrine of transubstantiation that there remains nothing, for in the visible form of bread remains the proper object of every sense truly; that is seen with the bodily eye is truly seen; that is felt is truly felt; that is savoured is truly savoured. . . . The doctrine of transubstantiation does not teach no earthly thing to remain in the sacrament, but contrariwise, that the visible form of bread and wine is there as the visible sign of the sacrament . . . and yet the substance of those visible creatures to be converted into the substance of the Body of Christ(33).)

The two contestants were obviously talking at cross-purposes. The Bishop of Winchester upheld one thing, while the Archbishop of Canterbury refuted another. The former held the Catholic doctrine apart from possible philosophical explanation. The latter tied scholasticism and dogma together and rejected both. He did not notice that if the scholastic explanation was

recent and, in his language, papistical, the dogma was ancient and patristic.

This confusion lies at Cranmer's door: led as he was by an excessively negative criterion, he went astray in his investigation of "primitivity". Yet there were times when Cranmer all but lifted the ambiguity. Thus he wrote in a remarkable passage:

I am glad that we come so near together, for you be almost right heartily welcome home, and I pray you let us shake hands. For we be agreed, as me seems, that Christ's body is present, and the same body that suffered; and we be agreed also of the manner of His presence. For you say that the Body of Christ is not present but after a spiritual manner, and so I say also. And if there be any difference between us two, it is but little, and in this point only: that I say that Christ is but spiritually in the ministration of the sacrament, and you say He is but after a spiritual manner in the sacrament. And yet you say He is corporally in the sacrament(34).

This irenic approach, however, is marred by an astonishing equation between "corporal" and "spacial". For Cranmer a corporal presence is a presence in a given space. As Christ's corporal presence is now in heaven, it cannot at the same time take place on earth, which forms another space. This argument from space and the consequent refusal of a multilocation of Christ's body recur time and again in Cranmer's arguments. This in spite of the fact that Gardiner and the Catholics¹ believed neither in a spacial presence nor in a multilocation of his Body. Cranmer concluded: "Christ is so in heaven that He is not on earth, which you utterly deny, and it is the chief point of contention between us"(35). Cranmer had misplaced the problem. In his eagerness to reject scholasticism, he leaned on a dubious philosophy of presence. Thus he contributed another ambiguity to the debate.

(For Gardiner, real presence and transubstantiation were one and the same thing. For Cranmer and his friends, they were not.) Gardiner could see their misunderstanding. He knew that at the word "transubstantiation" the Protestants would inveigh scholasticism. In order to keep to the point of faith and to avoid

quarrelling over words, he eschewed the term when he examined suspects under Queen Mary. To John Bradford he made this clear: "We ask no question of transubstantiation, but of the bodily presence" (36). Thus Gardiner tried to clarify a point which his adversaries constantly confused. But his efforts were largely vain. At the convenient time when Gardiner was imprisoned in the Tower, Cranmer had his first Book of Common Prayer published in 1549. In a conference with Protector Somerset and members of the King's Council, Gardiner subscribed to the Prayer Book, which he found agreeable to the Catholic doctrine on the real presence. His subsequent *Explication of the Catholic Faith touching the Sacrament of the Altar* (1551) pointed to five passages where the Prayer Book supported Catholic doctrine. Cranmer was infuriated. He now at last understood that the Bishop of Winchester saw no difference between the real presence, even called spiritual, and transubstantiation. In his Thirteen Articles of 1538, Cranmer still accepted the real presence in the sacrament (Art. 7). He now proceeded one step further. As transubstantiation is tied up with the real presence in the mind of Catholics, the best way to destroy the former is to abandon the latter also.

The second Prayer Book therefore erased every trace of the real presence: the five passages lauded by Gardiner were suppressed or substantially altered. Cranmer's *Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine* (1550) already leant toward a Zwinglian conception of the Supper: Christ's presence is only a presence by faith, of which communion is the occasion. His *Answer* (1551) to Gardiner's *Explication* makes this still clearer: "How often do I teach and repeat again and again that as corporally with our mouths we eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine, so spiritually with our hearts, by faith, do we eat Christ's very flesh and drink his very blood, and do both feed and live spiritually by him, *although corporally he be absent from us* and sits in heaven at his Father's right hand" (37). This is the doctrine of the so-called "real absence" of Christ from the sacrament. By faith we commune with Christ, present in heaven yet absent from earth.

This is no longer a presence at one remove. It is the negation of presence. How far Cranmer walked along this road away from

the Catholic Eucharistic doctrine receives weird light from a most remarkable definition of the sacrament. (From 1550 to 1552 the Archbishop of Canterbury led a commission of divines working on a projected Canon Law reform. They hit on a definition of the Holy Eucharist the blandness of which has never been equalled: it is "a sacrament in which they who sit as guests at the Lord's Holy Table eat bread and drink wine" (38).)

(Cranmer had reached this surprising minimum by elimination. First transubstantiation was jettisoned as a papistical invention, the real presence being kept. Then Gardiner pointed out that Catholic faith does not go to a scholastic theory, but to a fact which may be expressed by the word transubstantiation or the phrase real presence. Cranmer then forsook the real presence. There remained only a "spiritual" presence amounting to a real absence, Christ being corporally distant from us in heaven while we "live spiritually by him".)

★

The ambiguity of Cranmer's stand by primitive Catholicity is eloquently suggested by his Eucharistic conceptions. The primitivity which Cranmer equated with the "true and Catholic doctrine" cannot be directly ascertained. This was to be expected. One cannot jump over centuries of Church life and read the Gospels as though there had been a void between the Apostles and ourselves. Cranmer was no historian. As a theologian he had no brilliant mind. From the standpoint of history as of theology, Stephen Gardiner was right in distinguishing between transubstantiation as a theory on "how", and transubstantiation as a statement of the real presence. It may be that Cranmer lacked time or acumen for a keen theological analysis. At any rate he constantly misunderstood the position of his Catholic opponents. In the absence of a stable criterion of faith he relied on occasional substitutes. (He sincerely desired to restore the order of the primitive Church, and step by step he came to rely excessively on a process of elimination based on an anti-Rome prejudice.)

Cranmer thus successively relinquished every doctrine that he could tie up with the Papacy. But he forgot to count the cost:

he had to re-interpret the Church Fathers. He did it in the light of a conception of presence, spiritual and corporal, which, far from being patristic and scriptural, was a very trite product of a decadent scholasticism: that of a corporal presence by spacial location, which he denied of Christ in the Eucharist, and that of a spiritual presence by prayer and remembrance, which he affirmed. He embraced thus what he claimed to loathe, a philosophy, and a bad one at that.

On episcopal succession, Cranmer started from a medieval view of imperial authority; and he ended, after a number of mental contortions, by making episcopal ordination and consecration a luxury. (By implication, the first centuries to which he claimed fidelity became an abnormal period, bereft of imperial Christian authority; and the Catholicity of his doctrine on episcopacy was neither Catholic nor primitive.)

(Thus Cranmer's quest for Catholicity ended on the road to Zurich.)

Chapter Two

THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

The Dean: *But who will you have to be judge of the word of God?*

The Puritan: *Why, that was the saying of the papists in Queen Mary's time.*

PURITANS were returned in strength to the Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth I. They started work with an anticipation of triumph. At least during the first half of the reign, they really believed in the brave new world which they were going to create. England would not be satisfied with half-measures. She was not destined to remain a half-way house. She would be truly the primitive Church restored. The Marian exiles who returned from Frankfurt, Strasbourg, Zurich, Geneva and other high spots of the Continental Reformation brought with them the memory of those "best reformed" Churches. Many of them carried, in their mind at least, blue-prints for a final Reformation of the Church of England. Revised versions of the Book of Common Prayer, more agreeable to the mind of Calvin than the relatively restrained productions of Cranmer, had been experimented at Frankfurt or Strasbourg. (As far as the House of Commons was concerned, the task of the reign was the Protestantization of the Church.)

Elizabeth inherited from her sister a bench of bishops that was of an altogether different mind. Of the twenty-six episcopal sees of the country, ten were vacant at the end of 1558. The remaining sixteen bishops were openly Catholic and papalist. Given the sharp curves of English religious policy in the sixteenth century, one might have expected a number of them to conform to the new look. Elizabeth no doubt relied on it. She was disappointed. At Queen Mary's funeral, John White, Bishop of Winchester,

openly preached against restoring the Royal Supremacy(1). In the House of Lords the bishops systematically opposed every move to steer the Church in a Protestant direction. Eventually, all but one of them were deposed from their sees for their Catholic obstruction. If the Puritans in the Commons were eager to reform the Church, the bishops in the House of Lords were no less earnest in their resistance to every reforming bill. To Protestants the Commons represented the will of the people. To Catholics the bishops voiced the mind of the Church. No compromise could have been possible there.

As for the Queen, she belonged to neither side. Not that she had no convictions. As far as can be ascertained, her religion seems to have been a cross between the non-papal Catholicism of Henry VIII and the moderate Lutheranism of the Augsburg Confession. She would have been satisfied with a restoration of the first Prayer Book of 1549. But given the mood of the House of Commons this was not possible. If Elizabeth could have persuaded Parliament to adopt the Augsburg Confession, she probably would have done so. This is at least what she confided to a Spanish ambassador, adding that "she differed very little from us (Catholics), as she believed that God was in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and only dissented from three or four things in the Mass"(2). This was not Protestant language, nor was it diplomatic evasion. As a point of fact, Elizabeth was not loath to keep some Roman Catholics around her, even though she would also include extreme Puritans among her advisers.

The Church of England under Elizabeth was thus entangled in a triangular struggle. The Catholic bishops fought a losing battle for Roman Catholicism. The Puritans tried to bore through the Establishment from the inside in order to make it, willy nilly, one of the "best reformed" Churches. The Queen did all in her might to stifle Roman Catholic opposition and to restrain Puritan enthusiasm. The bishops were quickly eliminated and replaced by Protestant successors. Yet the religious controversy remained triangular. The exiled Catholic Recusants led a valiant rearguard action against both the Puritans and the moderating Queen. But geographically and officially they now were out

of the Church of England. We shall therefore be concerned only with the two other sides of the triangle.



One of the first Puritan moves in the Parliament of 1559 was the successful passage of a Bill suppressing the few monasteries that Mary had restored. It is significant that the promoters of the Bill argued on the ground of "Catholicity". Under Mary, according to them, the realm had been reduced to "rules, ordinances, rites and ceremonies in their services and common prayers, repugnant to the usage of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ"(3). The Puritans claimed to re-establish the usage of the holy, Catholic and apostolic Church. Their first major victory was the adoption, in 1559, of the second Prayer Book of 1552. This was not a complete triumph. They succeeded in including a Zwinglian expression in the formula for Holy Communion: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." Yet this was strangely tacked on to the formula of 1549, which Bishop Gardiner had found consonant with the doctrine of transubstantiation: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life". This astonishing brotherhood of contradictory texts is a fitting symbol of the uneasy progress of the Puritan wave.)

(What eventually galled the Protestants most was the addition of an Ornaments rubric. In the Catholic and apostolic Church of primitive times no special vestments were worn. This is at least what the Puritans maintained, with a happy unconcern for the fact that they were completely unable to prove their point.) Every prop of idolatry or superstition must be removed. Zwingli had done it in Zurich, Calvin at Geneva, Bucer in Strasbourg. Luther had not gone that far. But the Lutheran Churches were not, for that matter, best reformed. Nor was the Queen's gracious Majesty herself. Elizabeth made it clear from the first that she wanted ecclesiastical vestments in the Church. To the Puritan divines, this meant that she was badly informed. Their Queen

was, in the words of the future bishop John Jewel, "wise and religious, . . . favourably and propitiously disposed towards us"(4). The self-appointed task of the Puritan divines and their supporters in the Commons was to free the Queen from the bad influence of reactionary counsellors. For she herself was beyond criticism. Throughout her reign the Queen vetoed all the Puritan attempts to forbid the use of vestments and ceremonies. By a strange blindness the Puritans never grasped that the Queen disagreed with their view of what a Catholic church should be.)

The Puritans voted for the Prayer Book in 1559. (At the Parliament of 1566 they tried to make the Articles of Religion into the law of the land, an attempt which was foiled by the House of Lords acting on representation by the Queen. Yet they were satisfied neither with the Prayer Book nor with the Articles. In Puritan eyes these transitional measures were destined to herald a more radical reformation.) The Church of England under Elizabeth was in "an interimist state". Eventually it should become the definitive model of Christendom.

Until the Parliament of 1571 the Puritan effort aimed at the elimination of externals. It was the time of the Vestiarian controversy. These efforts were vain. As it sometimes happens, failure became an incentive to more drastic demands. In 1570, Thomas Cartwright, lecturing at Cambridge on the Acts of the Apostles, had expounded on the structure of the primitive Church. According to him, this was not episcopal but Presbyterian. Its present image was to be found in Switzerland, not in England. This implied more than a hint that a return to primitivity in vestments would not be enough. Primitivity in structure must not be overlooked. (There were no bishops in the primitive Church as seen through Puritan glasses.) In 1571, Parliament unsuccessfully tried to make Cranmer's *Reformatio Legum* of 1550-2 into law. While maintaining bishops, this would have imposed on the Church a thoroughly Protestant outlook. The Commons also—and this time the Queen did not veto their bill—enforced the Articles on the clergy. But an escape clause was introduced for Puritan scruples in matters of vestments: only articles which "concern the confession of the true faith and the doctrine of the

sacraments" are binding. Ceremonial articles are not. By 1572, Cartwright, who had been thrown out of Cambridge, was lecturing at Geneva. Anti-episcopal propaganda was open and popular. The Calvinist practice of holding "prophesyings" spread: these were informal gatherings of clergy and sometimes laity, with a view to mutual edification and correction. Out of these prophesyings a Presbyterian pattern of Church order could easily develop. With cocksure anticipation, some clergymen began to use, more or less privately, Calvinist forms of the communion service.

This Presbyterian movement tended to restore a supposedly primitive pattern of the Church. In as far as this pattern was considered to be the true Catholic one, it made use of a criterion of Catholicity with which we are now familiar. The Puritans walked in the footsteps of Thomas Cranmer. Catholicity for them meant primitivity. How does one discover primitivity? Thomas Cartwright, the theologian and intellectual spokesman for Puritanism, had recourse to history: he found no episcopal structure in the primitive Church as depicted in the Acts of the Apostles. Yet behind this historical standard, one suspects that two criteria of Catholicity were also at work. Positively, Catholicity meant conformity with the "best reformed" Churches, of Geneva and other holy places. Negatively, it implied opposition to all papistical usages and beliefs.

In the course of the Vestiarian controversy, Grindal, then Bishop of London, examined a group of Puritans:

The Bishop: All the learned are against you; will you be tried by them?

White: We will be tried by the word of God, which shall judge us all at the last day.

The Dean: But who will you have to be judge of the word of God?

Hawkins: Why, that was the saying of the papists in Queen Mary's time(s).

To Puritan eyes, there was great danger in using papistical vestments, papistical ceremonies and papistical sayings: it entailed a renunciation of primitive Catholicity and a delay in making the

Church of England a truly reformed body moulded on the primitive Church. This was not all. For the bishops themselves were lured towards a more subtle danger. Their very function was papistical. In 1576 a certain Peter Wentworth accused Archbishop Grindal of making "a very Pope-like speech" and the bishops in general of taking over the canonical claims of the Pope of Rome(6). Under Edward VI the Puritan John Hooper was placed in a dilemma when he found himself elevated to a bishopric. After a slightly ludicrous resistance he accepted to be consecrated wearing liturgical vestments. But this could not convert him to an episcopal faith. He believed that "those who teach the people to know the Church by these signs, the traditions of men and the succession of bishops, teach wrong"(7). As a bishop he therefore ordered his clergy to teach that "the Church of God is not by God's word taken for the multitude or company of men, as of bishops, priests and such other, but that it is the company of all men hearing God's word and obeying unto the same"(8). Puritans who became bishops under Elizabeth could go by Hooper's precedent. They nevertheless were not shielded from the attacks of their Puritan brethren who had not been so elevated to the bench of bishops. It was to be expected of human frailty that under the impact of these assaults a number of Puritan prelates forsook their anti-episcopalian prejudices. As a matter of fact, the rash identification of episcopal and papal prompted a strong episcopal reaction in the second half of Elizabeth's reign.



The recourse to anti-papalism as a criterion of sound faith and proper usage had a comical side. The Archbishop of Canterbury was suspected of papalism because he used expressions that might have been heard from the lips of Roman Catholics. Yet he himself was not averse to opposing the same argument to his adversaries. He did it with no less a person than the Queen. Edmund Grindal, actually, had Puritan sympathies. He had travelled on the Continent during Mary's reign. He had first-hand experience of the Calvinist meetings on which the English "prophesyings" were patterned. When the Queen ordered him

to forbid prophesyings, he flatly refused. Why? To decide on such a measure by way of authority, he objected to Elizabeth, "is the anti-Christian voice of the Pope"(9). This bold warning was given in 1576. When he died in 1583, Grindal was still out of favour with the Court. Though he nominally remained Archbishop of Canterbury, he had been forced into semi-retirement ever since he hinted that the Queen was a crypto-Papist. Well may we exclaim, with William Fulke, "This ambiguity of supreme authority!"(10)

The Puritan plot to capture the Establishment resulted in a shift of emphasis in the concept of Catholicity. The Anglican polemicists who argued with the Catholic Recusants, and those who wrote against the Puritans, adopted diverse standpoints. The former willingly identified Catholicity with anti-Romanism. The latter could not do so, lest Puritanism should turn out to be the best embodiment of Catholicity. We therefore find two strains in the theology of the Elizabethan settlement.

(The anti-Roman strain was well represented by the Bishop of Salisbury, John Jewel. A former Marian exile, he had returned to England with definitely Protestant views, though, being a man of common sense, he was willing to compromise on matters of vestments and ceremonies. He was made a bishop by Elizabeth in 1559. Against the Recusants he became the outstanding exponent of Anglican theology.)

Jewel's originality as an anti-Roman controversialist is that he argued on the very ground of his adversaries. The Recusants based their stand on the faith of the universal Church. In the words of Jewel's main opponent, Thomas Harding, "We never took ourselves bound to any private opinion of whatsoever doctor, for all our faith is Catholic, that is to say, universal, such as not one doctor alone, but the universal number of doctors have taught and Christian people have received"(11). Jewel's strategy was to steal this piece from the Recusant armory. (His *Apology for the Church of England* (1562) contained a famous challenge: Jewel pledged himself to submit to Rome if ever it should be proven that Roman doctrine tallied with the consensus of the first centuries. Jewel as a polemicist appealed to the Catholicity

of the first six centuries of the Church. His endless controversy with Harding consisted in a prolonged analysis of patristic passages. His approval of the Elizabethan settlement was grounded on the fact that it came "as near as we possibly could to the Church of the Apostles and of the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers"(12). In brief, his appeal was to Catholicity in antiquity.)

Jewel as a believer, however, also called on another universality: the consensus of the Reformation. The seed from Geneva and Wittenberg had, for him, become the great tree of the Reformation(13). As he understood it, the Church of England was in perfect agreement, in things essential, with all the Continental Reformers, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Bucer, etc. Thus Catholicity in history referred the Church of England back to the early Church Fathers; and Catholicity in the present united it in doctrine and brotherhood with the reformed Churches of the Continent.) As they rejected this twofold Catholicity, the Recusants were not genuinely Catholic.

This argument was pungently expressed by Robert Crowley, Vicar of St Giles in London:

This note "Catholic" does descry the Pope and Papists to be schismatics and their religion schismatical. On the contrary, the same note does show that we, I mean the Protestants of this realm of England and of all other countries whatsoever . . . are the right Catholics, and the faith that we profess is the right Catholic faith, and all we together the right Catholic Church. And whosoever is not a member of this Catholic Church, the same can have no salvation by Christ, because he is none of His people, for whom He died to save them from their sins(14).

Likewise, Walter Haddon described Romanism as schism: "You are fallen away little by little from this ancient Church, the invincible fortress of the truth"(15). Haddon rejected transubstantiation by an appeal to Catholicity: "I, according to the doctrine and approved use of the true Catholic and apostolic Church, do utterly renounce senses, accidents, substances and transformations, and do advisedly behold and comprehend in my mind the sacrament, the mystery and the spirit"(16). Against the schismatical Church of Rome William Fulke, Master of

Pembroke Hall in Cambridge, called on "the writers of the most ancient and pure Church"(17). Protestant doctrines were, for him, backed by "the consent of most of the Catholic Churches"(18) in the past as in the present.

By equating Protestantism and primitivity, these Anglican theologians reversed the Roman Catholic appeal to Catholicity. The true mark of Catholicity is to be found, not in Rome, but in Geneva and in the other godly Churches of the Reformation. The universality of the reformed Churches is the hallmark of Catholicity in the present, as the consensus of the Fathers was the touchstone of Catholicity in the past. Both coincide. Had it followed the lead of these men, the Church of England would have become, in doctrine, indistinguishable from the Protestant Churches of Switzerland.

★

(The Church's structure must obviously be affected by this conception of Catholicity as essentially Protestant. The Articles of Religion adopted by Convocation in 1562-3 bore the mark of this school of Anglican theology. It is therefore not surprising that Article XIX should propose a purely Protestant definition of the Church: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be truly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.") This is equivalent to the Lutheran definition contained in the Confession of Augsburg: "The Church is a congregation of saints, in which the Gospel is rightly taught and the sacraments are rightly administered"(19). It also corresponds to Calvin's famous conclusion: "Wherever we see the Word of God to be purely preached and listened to, the sacraments to be administered according to Christ's institution, there one must entertain no doubt that there is a Church"(20). (The frame of the Church of England was episcopal. Yet Article XIX does not even allude to episcopacy. Bishops are mentioned in Article XXXVI, but only to the effect that their consecration contains everything necessary and nothing superstitious. Of what bishops are and of their function we are told not a word. This is no oversight.)

To the mind of the Puritans, of course, bishops are superfluous. At first the Elizabethan Puritans attacked vestments and liturgy. This implied a challenge to the authority of bishops to impose vestments and ceremonies. After a while—1571 being the turning-point—the Puritans openly questioned the nature of the episcopal institution.

(The difference between Puritans and semi-Puritan bishops like John Jewel was slight.) Jewel also contended that bishops were unnecessary. Geneva and Zurich had none; yet they were truly Catholic Churches. There was a difference on that score between London and Geneva because Geneva did not enjoy the Royal Supremacy. Since the Church is invisible (21) the secular authority may organize worship and discipline as will best tally with the customs and mentality of each land. The royal function in the Church of England is one of organization (22). The Queen has thought it wiser not to break with the old practice: she has therefore appointed bishops, as the Kings before her had done.

In this explanation, Jewel minimized the Royal Supremacy. In matters of "God's word" the King must follow the bishops that he has himself appointed (23), for he is not Supreme Head of the Church. Elizabeth had declined the title, partly as a bid for Puritan support, partly because she simply found it distasteful. Jewel approved of this, and even pushed his zeal a little too far in whitening Henry VIII: according to Jewel, the Catholic bishops themselves were responsible for giving the title to Henry. And their intention was to make the King a laughing-stock and to discredit the Reformation! (24) This is re-writing history at its most fanciful. Yet it at least shows that Anglicans were not of one mind on the Queen's prerogative in matters of religion. According to the Queen's constant interpretation of the Royal Supremacy, she alone had authority to decide religious matters. And she made it a rule that religion was not to be discussed in Parliament, but in Convocation. The House of Commons no less constantly contravened this, and, with few exceptions, their decisions ran into royal vetoes liberally doled out. Jewel travelled a middle way: Parliament may debate what they like. Authority in discipline proceeds from the Queen; but authority in doctrine

lies only with God's word(25). Episcopacy is a disciplinary matter. Like Cranmer before him, Jewel esteemed that bishops were made by nomination. Consecration was not required(26). A bishop is only a priest to whom the Crown has entrusted special functions. He is an administrator.

The Catholic Jerome Osorio could therefore blame Anglicans for transferring the teaching function of bishops to theologians and thus jeopardizing the Catholic concept of episcopacy(27). The reproach carried home. Yet the Elizabethan Anglicans were no innovators. The innovation had been made by Thomas Cranmer, for whom bishops were only civil servants of the King in matters ecclesiastical.

This conception of episcopacy implied two more points. In the first place, there is no difference of Orders between bishops and priests. In his polemics against Jewel, Thomas Harding took this up. Jewel's theology was dead set against the practice of confessing sins to priests(28). Jewel also maintained that Christ alone is Priest according to the Order of Melchisedech(29). Putting two and two together, Harding concluded that for Jewel bishops, priests and laity are one and the same: all the people are bishops(30). This was not Jewel's explicit conclusion. Yet it was a telling objection to his theology.)

In the second place, Jewel's episcopacy is not of divine institution, but is only a creation of the Church. Once it has outlived its usefulness, it may be discarded. Thus Jewel approved of the Presbyterianism of the Continental Reformation: the bishops who refused to reform the Church forfeited their function.)

At any rate episcopacy is no mark of a Catholic Church. The criteria of Catholicity do not belong to the domain of organization. They are to be found in the profession of a pure doctrine and in agreement with the first centuries.

★

If Jewel's theology of Order provided a sharp tool in anti-Roman polemics, it could be of no use against the Presbyterian agitation of the last decades of the sixteenth century, for it gave away too much to Presbyterian conceptions. If the Anglicans

had not, by reaction against the Puritans, opened other paths, the English episcopate would quickly have been on the way out. Fortunately a recovery took place. In a remarkable episcopalian revival the tendency grew to define Catholicity by reference to the episcopal structure of the Church.)

The main challenge to the Puritans came from the future Archbishop Richard Bancroft. Paul's Cross, which was the scene of so many memorable sermons in the course of the English Reformation, was again in the limelight. There, on 9th February 1588, Bancroft delivered a sermon which clearly implied his belief in the divine origin of the episcopate and, consequently, in its essential function in the Church. The challenge did not pass unnoticed. Sir Francis Knollys, a Puritan champion who was related to the Queen, raised the alarm: such a claim runs counter to the Royal Prerogative. Bishops must be silenced. They must be forced to recognize that "they have no superiority of government at all but by commission from Her Majesty" (31).

If Elizabeth's theology was superficial, her judgment was superior. Far from touching Bancroft, she silenced Knollys, her cousin. This gave the green light to the defenders of orthodoxy. The next few years witnessed Bancroft's powerful assaults on Presbyterianism: his *Dangerous Positions and Proceedings* and his *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, both of 1593. If there was little theology in the former, its revelations on Puritan gatherings provided sensational reading-matter. The latter contained an able refutation of the Puritan concept of Church order. At the same period, Hadrian Saravia published his *Treatise on the Different Degrees of the Christian Priesthood* (1590); Matthew Sutcliffe his *De Presbyterio* and his *Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline*, both in 1591; Thomas Bilson, Bishop of London, his *Perpetual Government of Christ's Church* (1593); John Bridges, Dean of Salisbury, his *Defense of the Government established in the Church of England* (1587).

We may select Saravia's work for special treatment: it is a thoroughgoing vindication of episcopacy. Hadrian Saravia (1531-1613) had been a Reformed minister in his native Netherlands. He migrated to England after arriving at the conclusion

that of all the Churches the Church of England was most faithfully patterned on primitive Christianity.

(Saravia's first concern was with Catholicity. Neither Scripture alone nor patristic unanimity alone satisfied him. He wanted both, for a Catholic Church is faithful to both. "Against the unanimous and constant consensus of all the Fathers of the ancient Church, nothing may be innovated without an explicit word of God"(32). His standard was "the universal consent of all Churches throughout the world, which is moreover consonant with the word of God"(33). This implies Catholicity as a universal consensus in faith. The word of God and the traditional unanimity of the Church are so tied together that on the basis of a unanimous tradition one may conclude to a word of God.) Saravia approves the criterion of St Irenaeus: "That must be an apostolical tradition and divine institution, which has been received in all the Churches founded by the Apostles"(34).

According to the universal tradition that Saravia held to be the standard of faith, three elements constitute a Catholic Church: "No true Church can exist without the preaching of the word of God, the use of the sacraments, and ecclesiastical regimen"(35). The Church's institutional structure has thus found its way back into the definition of the Church. The Protestant diagram, word and sacraments, is corrected by a third incident: the regimen. We are no longer in a reformed ecclesiology of the Calvinist or even the Lutheran type.

True it is, the Puritans also found the Church's regimen in Holy Scripture. But their interpretation of Scripture was at variance with the universal tradition. Because the terms "bishop" and "presbyter" are indifferently used in Holy Writ, the Puritans denied any distinction between the two Orders. But this is making light of the patristic datum. Far from discovering scriptural warrant for Presbyterianism, Saravia taught that a twofold ministry is clearly affirmed, both by Scripture and by patristic testimony. The names of bishops and priests are not assigned to two distinct orders in Scripture. Nevertheless two Orders are well distinguished:

We are thus led as it were by the hand to conclude that two Orders of presbyters of different authority were instituted under the Apostles and by the Apostles themselves, for the purpose of ruling the Church with them, to which Orders posterity has assigned distinct names, although Scripture has not done so(36).

From what has now been said concerning the Gospel ministry as instituted by Our Lord, left to the Churches by the Apostles, confirmed by the unanimous consent of the Fathers and Councils and the practice of the universal Church, any one may perceive that the form of regimen according to which presbyters are subject to bishops as to their superiors, and bishops to their patriarchs and metropolitans, is not a human device, but divine, and instituted by God(37).

The bishops' function is to teach: "The ordinary teachers of the Church are the Bishops, nor would there be need of either presbyters and deacons, could they, single-handed, discharge all its offices"(38).

(The question may naturally be mooted, how this theology differs from that of the Roman Catholic upholders of episcopacy.) Certainly, anti-Romanism is no longer, with Saravia, a criterion of faith. "The things received in the Church of Rome as it is now may be divided into three heads: some are agreeable to the word of God, some directly opposed to it, and most are things indifferent or of a middle nature, according as they are used or abused"(39). Episcopacy belongs to the first category; the papacy, according to Saravia, to the second. Yet on what ground is the papacy declared contrary to Scripture rather than "of a middle nature, according as it is used or abused"? The answer is to be found in Saravia's conciliaristic option. (As against the claims of the See of Rome, he saw in conciliarism the medieval echo of patristic unanimity: the divinely instituted regimen of the Church is not monarchic but aristocratic(40). It requires a brotherly agreement among bishops, not the submission of all to one of them.)

With other works written supporting the divine institution of episcopacy, this able theological effort saved the Church of England from falling into Presbyterianism. It thereby made possible an Anglican return to a Catholic conception of the

Church's structure. These various authors ensured the continuation of episcopacy as conceived by the first Anglicans. The Puritans, admittedly, were not convinced. Theologically they denied the premise, that episcopacy is in the New Testament. Politically they contended that such an exorbitant claim would make the bishops, in the words of Sir Francis Knollys, "tyrannous over the inferior clergy"(41). They would not be quietened by Bishop Bilson's assurance: "So long as we give bishops no charge but pastoral, no power but paternal, we are not in danger of violating either the Saviour's or the Apostles' precepts"(42).

One thing was achieved, however, by this episcopalian reaction. It cleared the issue between Episcopalian-Anglicans and Presbyterian-Anglicans. The endorsement of episcopacy by obedience to the royal will began to give way to a less pragmatic point of view. In his anti-Puritan *opus magnum*, *Defence of the Answer* (1572), John Whitgift, the future Archbishop of Canterbury, had judged that the episcopate was not essential to a truly reformed Church, for no form of government was prescribed in God's word. By 1593, however, he had shifted his position. Whitgift now maintained "that the episcopal degree, which we bear, is an institution apostolical and divine, and so has always been held by a continued course of times from the Apostles to this very age of ours"(43). (The great Richard Hooker himself seems to have undergone an evolution on this point. In Book III of the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, he hesitated as to the absolute necessity and divine institution of episcopacy.) The most he would say was that government by bishops is "that which best agrees with the Sacred Scripture". Its absence in a Church would be a "defect and imperfection"(44). (Book VII, however, was a further step removed from Protestantism: episcopal government is now an apostolic institution(45).)

★

Under the surface, this powerful defence of the Anglican settlement against Presbyterian claims contained an ambiguous point. Saravia mixed two questions that ought to be distinguished. In order to maintain the Catholic structure of the Church, one

must defend the apostolic origin of episcopacy. Whether bishops and priests belong to one Order or to two Orders is another question. In his eagerness to assert the first point, Saravia also took the second for granted. By so doing he accepted a dilemma which was implicit in the Presbyterian criticism of episcopacy. Either episcopacy is both an Order and of divine origin, or it is neither. Cranmer and Jewel, followed by the Puritans, thought that it was neither; Saravia, that it was both. Yet there was another way out. Anglo-Catholics, then as now, tend to confuse the two problems of the nature and of the origin of episcopacy. In this they show less acumen than their Roman Catholic friends. The difference between priests and bishops was freely discussed among Roman Catholics in the sixteenth century. It still is, for that matter, a moot point. It is admissible to hold that bishops and priests share the sacrament of Order to the same degree; but bishops alone stand in the stream of apostolic succession which gives them the authority necessary to use some of the sacerdotal powers.

One may wonder if the Elizabethan Anglicans were committed to a confusion of the two problems. In his *Defence of the English Translations of the Holy Scriptures* (1583), William Fulke distinguished between the equality of bishops and priests "in authority of ministering the word and the sacraments", and the superiority of bishops over priests "for government and discipline"(46). In his posthumous *Confutation of the Rhemish New Testament*, he repeated: "Bishops and elders differ not in Order, but only in office of government"(47). Fulke, admittedly, had puritan leanings, and the equality of bishops and elders in the ministry of the word and the sacraments may receive a Presbyterian interpretation. Richard Bancroft's *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline* (1593) quoted Fulke in favour of the distinction between bishops and priests. Bancroft argued from it that bishops were "appointed in the Apostles' time for the right order and government of the Church of Christ"(48). Yet he does not seem to have fully endorsed Fulke's distinction between government and preaching or, as we would say, between jurisdiction and Order. However, a short manuscript which has been assigned to

Bancroft and probably dates from the years 1583 to 1585 is more explicit on this point. It describes the institution of episcopacy by the Apostles as a means to perpetuate their authority. Then the manuscript adds: "It is not denied but that there is an equality of all ministers of God's word *quoad ministerium*. For they have all a like power to preach the word, to minister the sacraments—that is to say, the word preached or the sacraments ministered is as effectual in the one in respect of the ministry as in the other. But *quoad ordinem et politiam* there always has been and must be degrees and superiority among them." Accordingly, degrees of authority—archbishops, bishops, priests—are apostolic, but "only for order's sake, policy and government"(49). If this does proceed from Bancroft's pen, his later and more elaborate works would have toned down the equality of ministers *quoad ministerium*, presumably for the sake of sharpening his anti-Presbyterian weapons.

As long as Anglican theology developed in opposition to Presbyterianism, circumstances were not favourable to the position suggested by Fulke, asserted, probably by Bancroft, in *Certain Slandrous Speeches*, and casually mentioned in Bancroft's *Survey*. Since that time the Church of England has not ceased to be threatened by the Presbyterian tendencies that are implicit in every low doctrine of the Church. For this reason Saravia's view of episcopacy as differing from priesthood in Orders no less than in jurisdiction, has dominated Anglo-Catholic thinking. In spite of some discordant notes, Anglo-Catholics have heavily come forward in favour of one school of Catholic theology, ignoring—more than opposing—the other. It has thus been marked by the polemics that shook its cradle at the end of the sixteenth century.



A remarkable contribution to the Anglican concept of Catholicity was made by the theologians who counted episcopacy as an essential element of Church structure. Through the anti-Puritan polemics of the seventeenth century, this structural standpoint will survive in Anglican thought, to be finally embodied in the

famed Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888. Several interpretations of episcopacy will meanwhile vie for supremacy, and this down to our day. Yet by and large the Anglo-Catholic regard for the episcopate as the apostolic framework of the Church's institution was firmly established by the end of the Elizabethan age.

One cannot leave the reign of Elizabeth I without paying attention to the contribution of Richard Hooker to the theological understanding of Catholicity. Until Hooker, Anglican theology was mostly polemical. It was the outcome of occasional writings prompted by anti-Roman and anti-Puritan controversies. Hooker's great work, *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, was also anti-Puritan. But it was not thought out in the heat of polemics. It was, on the contrary, written with a measure of detachment thanks to which Hooker could view the situation in a larger perspective. Hooker's main concern remained to blast the Puritan opposition to the worship and doctrine of the Church of England. Yet the debate was raised to a much higher level than that of the biblical literalism of the Puritan champions.

Most of the Anglican controversialists before Hooker were involved in endless quotations and interpretations of biblical and patristic texts. This is tedious to modern readers. Yet clarification of biblical and patristic issues was imperious at the time. Hooker, however, went beyond mere textual analysis. For him, the law of the Bible and the law of the Church, as expressed by the Fathers, cannot be severed from God's basic way of dealing with man in the law of nature. Accordingly, "the natural measure whereby to judge our doings is the sentence of reason, determining and setting down what is good to be done". Reason is universal: "The Law of reason or human nature is that which men by discourse of natural reason have rightly found out themselves to be all for ever bound unto in their actions"(50).

God has also spoken to man in the law of Scripture. Puritans know Scripture; but they do not read it aright. Being unaware of the law of nature, they scan Scripture for what is not in it. God has indeed repeated in his written word some of the things that nature already teaches; but he has not repeated all. Vainly do Puritans expect to find in the Bible all the details pertaining

to Church government. For general laws of government are sufficiently contained in the law of reason. Conformity to the established government is part of the law of reason, unless the established government be evidently against reason or Scripture:

Of peace and quietness there is not any way possible, unless the probable voice of every entire society or body politic overrule all private of like nature in the same body. Which thing effectually proves that God, being author of peace and not of confusion in the Church must needs be author of those men's peaceable resolutions, who concerning these things have determined with themselves to think and do as the Church they are of decrees, till they see necessary cause enforcing them to the contrary(51).

In other words, the law of reason, which has, like Scripture itself, its absolute universal elements, points to a third law. This is still reason, but at one remove. Its way is that of advisability, of reasonableness, of experience. Hooker refers therefore to three terms: "Nature, Scripture, experience"(52). He thus appeals to the Church's tradition: the common experience of Christians throws light on the Gospel. By implication, Hooker also restores to Anglican theology a dimension which has largely been lost: he reopens Anglican thought to a conception of doctrine as a developing awareness of Scripture in the Church's experience. Hooker does not equate traditions and the Gospel. He nonetheless senses that Scripture is pregnant with a "full and complete measure of things necessary" which has not yet, and may never be thoroughly brought to light: "Let us not think that as long as the world does endure, the wit of man shall be able to sound the bottom of that which may be concluded out of Scripture"(53).

Since they neglect nature and experience, Puritans cannot help misunderstanding Scripture. Roman Catholics, too, promote a "corrupt religion"(54). For, as Hooker sees it, they have raised the Pope's authority above reason and Scripture. No decision of any single person may lord it over the God-revealed laws. An appeal to traditions over against reason and Holy Writ would subvert Catholicity. This was the Roman position, as Hooker read, or misread, it. Yet Hooker never erected anti-Romanism

into a norm of Catholicity. He did not wish to throw away "any good or convenient thing only because the Church of Rome might perhaps like it"(55). He did not count himself among those "which measure religion by dislike of the Church of Rome"(56). Hooker's Catholicity wound its way between Romanism and Puritanism, avoiding "swervings on the one hand or on the other"(57). The reason on which it was based binds all in its general principles, yet admits of sundry practices and customs according to time and clime. The Scripture it adhered to guarantees "that ancient integrity which Jesus Christ by His word requires . . . as it is ingrafted in us by the power of the Holy Ghost opening the eyes of our understanding and so revealing the mysteries of God"(58). Neither nature nor Scripture may counter the continued life of the Church from the beginning, her traditions and her customs. Catholicity holds all three together, the natural law, the scriptural law and the traditional law: "In truth the ceremonies which we have taken from such as were before us, are not things that belong to this or that sect, but they are the ancient rites and customs of the Church of Christ, whereof we ourselves being a part, we have the selfsame interest in them which our fathers before us had, from whom the same are descended to us"(59). Both as regards doctrine and in matters of worship or customs, Hooker appealed to three inseparable criteria.

(For the first time in any systematic way Anglicanism presents itself as a *via media* between two systems accused of betraying traditional Catholicity. Both Puritans and Romans sin, by default or by excess. Anglicanism stands in the middle, preserving the Catholic faith from all corruptions. This at least is the picture that Hooker conveys. For the first time also, Anglican Catholicity has veered back to the natural law, to a due regard for logical reasoning and to a spontaneous respect for the broad assumptions of common sense. Thus Hooker opens several diverging lines.)

In the first place, the more recent theories of the Anglican *via media* may find in his theology a partial, and perhaps a complete justification. In the second, Hooker's concern for the law of reason is not unconnected with the claims of later Anglicans to hold a

"rational theology" having fraternal relations with the philosophy of the Enlightenment. In the third, his description of Catholicity as resting on the threefold basis of nature, Scripture and experience is germane to the Roman Catholic theology of the natural law, Scripture and the Church's tradition. It is therefore possible for later generations of Anglo-Catholics to correct Hooker's somewhat lopsided view of Roman Catholicism. Hooker's misreadings of Roman Catholic doctrine and practice being recognized, Anglo-Catholicism may, on the basis of its own conception of Catholicity, entertain friendlier relations with Roman Catholic thought and life.

Well may Richard Hooker be hailed by Anglicans, low or high, who define their worship and belief as a middle way between two extremes; by Broad-Churchmen, who seek rationality, if not rationalism; by Anglo-Catholics, who try to restore Anglicanism to full Catholicity. However, only the third standpoint does full justice to all the aspects of Hooker's thought. It alone keeps a good balance between the three elements of reason, Scripture and experience, of nature, the word and tradition. Broad-Churchmanship has sacrificed Scripture and tradition on the altar of reason. And a simple *via media* theology takes little account of the progress that knowledge of Church history has made since Hooker: the opposition between Roman Catholicism and the Catholicity envisioned by Hooker is not borne out by the facts as they may now be known. Thus Hooker's title to paternity is better honoured by Anglo-Catholicism than by any other kind of Anglican churchmanship.)



On the whole, the Elizabethan period saw the first major victory of the Anglicans in quest of Catholicity over those who were searching for a "best reformed" Church. The challenge to the Catholic doctrine on episcopacy, which had been adumbrated in the works of Cranmer and implied in the theology of John Jewel, came to a head with the second Puritan wave, in the 1580's. It then ran headlong into spirited resistance. By the scope of their questionings, the Puritans strengthened a growing

movement that was anxious to preserve Catholic values like the episcopal structure of the Church.

By this very fact the Anglican criteria of Catholicity were bound to evolve. Concern for primitivity, fear of supposedly Roman superstitions and of papal tyranny were common to Anglicans and to Puritans. Puritan excesses eventually discredited an exclusive identification of primitivity and Catholicity. The Episcopalian reaction opened the eyes to the fallacy of trying to recover apostolicity by disregarding the intermediate period. "A great leap, as I think, from the Apostles' time to this our age", Richard Bancroft exclaimed when he described the Puritan idea: "From Geneva to the Apostles' time, and then back again to Geneva at a leap"(60).

The acme of Elizabethan theology was precisely reached when Richard Hooker grounded his thinking on a highly inclusive notion of Catholicity, in close kinship to that of the medieval Schoolmen.

Chapter Three

THE CAROLINE DIVINES

To that heaven which belongs to the Catholic Church I shall never come, except I go by way of the Catholic Church, by former ideas, former examples, former patterns: to believe according to ancient beliefs, to pray according to ancient forms, to preach according to former meditations.—John Donne.

POSTHUMOUS fame has made the seventeenth century the Anglican century *par excellence*. Given the growing power of the Puritans in its first half and their triumph when prelacy, that is, episcopacy, was uprooted and the Puritan Commonwealth set up (1649–60), this assessment may seem overrated. After all, the seventeenth century nearly saw the exit of the Church of England from the scene. Yet political ebb and flow is one thing, doctrine another. As concerns doctrine, the English theologians of the seventeenth century made an outstanding contribution to the Anglican idea. Their achievements truly turned their age into the classic period of Anglican theology.

Even theologically speaking, not everything ran smoothly. The Puritan onslaught was not restricted to politics. Their short-lived victory became possible because in the guise of Puritan doctrines dry rot had crept into the framework of the Establishment. As under Queen Elizabeth, the House of Commons under the Stuart kings was a stronghold of Puritanism. The episcopal party had to take account of the widespread influence of Puritan ideas among the Anglican clergy itself. Once more, the lines were smudgy between those who desired to maintain the episcopal structure of the Church and those who claimed that a Presbyterian organization would better imitate the Christianity of primitive times. The rise of the Commonwealth on the ruins of both the monarchy and the Episcopal Church does not only serve as a

reminder that the most impressive cultural achievements lie at the mercy of the fortunes of war. The extent to which the Anglican clergy conformed, more or less willingly, to Puritan discipline suggests that the inner chambers of the Anglican abode were not so well built as its high gables indicated. The bishops themselves, perforce inactive during the Interregnum and justly fearing for their life, displayed little zeal to consecrate eventual successors. Granted, this move might have cost them their life or the little that remained of their liberty. But the continuity of the Church of England was at stake. More colourful personalities would have courted martyrdom to ensure the Church's future.

As for the laity, we know little of their knowledge of the faith. If we may generalize from the testimony of a rector of the early seventeenth century, however, an amazing ignorance was rampant. In 1602, Josiah Nichols, rector of Eastwell, Kent, wrote that when he arrived in his parish, "scarce ten in a hundred" had any knowledge of who Christ was⁽¹⁾. If this situation prevailed in rural areas, English Christianity was not at its most healthy. It is hardly surprising that populations that were badly instructed in the Church's doctrines would support the radical innovations of Presbyterians and Independents.

Anglicanism was thus undermined by popular ignorance. It was also menaced by the dynamism of Puritan preachers and the vitality of the Presbyterian party, ready to drive a wedge through every chink in the wall of the episcopal Establishment. Nor was this all. The patience of Roman Catholic Recusants under Elizabeth bore fruits under James I and Charles I. Strengthened by the spirit of the Counter-Reformation, English Roman Catholicism had started on the way back. It made inroads again in English territory. Its controversialists continued to flood the Kingdom with their publications. Priests landed in force, even before violent persecution had ceased. The clergy were reorganized both in England and in Ireland. Internal strife between secular and regular priests hindered their work. Yet for a religious group which had been all but wiped out, theirs was an amazing come-back. Many are the Anglican writings of the first half of the seventeenth century which tried to stave off Roman Catholic proselytism.

Necessity has many stimulating qualities. Goaded from the right and the left, by rivals abroad and by subversives at home, Anglican theologians gallantly attempted to define the Catholic consciousness of the Church of England more systematically than had been done by their forefathers. They were helped in this by two developments.

On the political front, the Stuart monarchy engineered a change in the conception and practice of the Royal Supremacy. James I did not wield the strong hand of Elizabeth, and he trusted his bishops more than she had done. Though still vested in the King, the Supremacy came more and more to be an official support of the theological views of the bench of bishops. This culminated in Archbishop Laud's liturgical reforms of 1539. The initiative in spiritual matters now lay with the bishops themselves. They were thus in a better position to uphold the Anglican settlement in doctrine and polity.

On the philosophical front, the English mind in many an instance set itself on a quest for a "rational theology", for a golden mean which would meet the requirements of reason while respecting faith. Lord Herbert with his quasi-deism, and the Cambridge Platonists, could hardly be called orthodox Christians by any known standard. Yet their concern for a philosophical middle way is not far estranged from the claim of the Laudian school of thought that England has struck a happy balance between the excesses of the Puritans and the positions of the Recusants.

Thus the Anglican theologians were from every side invited to justify their faith in terms of a mean between extremes. With the outwardly secure position of Anglicanism at the end of the Elizabethan age, controversies on particular points of doctrine had largely subsided. The theologians were no longer engaged in defining the Eucharist and other items of the Christian faith. Rather, they were anxious to formulate the relationship of their Church as a whole to the Church of past ages, to the present reformed Churches of the Continent, and to the continuing Church of Rome.



The divines of the first half of the century form a fairly homo-

geneous group. Several trends may no doubt be discerned, some being more Catholic, others more Protestant. In the main, however, their consensus makes it advisable to treat them together. This is especially called for as regards the notions of the Church and of Catholicity.

The Church must be Catholic. This is never questioned. In the words of Thomas Jackson, writing from his vicarage at Newcastle in 1626, "The word 'Catholic' is itself univocal in respect both of Church and faith. True faith is therefore Catholic faith, because it is the only door or way to salvation, alike common unto all, without national or topical respect. . . . The main question is, who they be that hold this Catholic faith and whether they hold it undefiled or not"(2). Being, by definition, common to all, the Catholic faith must be known by the universal consensus which upholds it. The Caroline divines insist therefore on the universality of Catholicism. Catholic, for them, means universal. Yet there is universality in extension, and universality in intention. Which is involved in Catholicism?)

A cursory reading of Anglican writers might well suggest that they are only interested in a superficial Catholicity. For Richard Crakanthorpe, "The Catholic Church is universal; it is total; it is diffused and disseminated throughout the world"(3). Lancelot Andrewes defines Catholic as "disseminated through all the world"(4). "The word 'Catholic'", Henry Hammond writes, "signifies universal, dispersed or extended all the world over, in opposition to the former state of the Jewish Church, which was an inclosure divided from all the world beside, in time of law"(5). In his delightful *Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England*(1661), William Nicholson, who later became Bishop of Gloucester, analyses the word "Catholic": it "signifies universal; and under it the amplitude and largeness of the Church is comprehended, it being extended to all places and persons. Formerly the Jews were only His people, but now the partition wall is broken down, and all nations, and all persons in all nations, have a capacity to be of the Church of Christ"(6). Here, actual Catholicity in extension implies potential Catholicity: the Church of Christ is destined to become the home of all mankind.

Every writer of the period has encomiums on the extension of the Church. These and like passages would suggest that the Catholic Church is identified with all Christian believers, to whatever institution they may belong. And the Catholic faith would be, correspondingly, the minimum consensus common to all Christians. It would then fade away among denominationalism.

(In spite of this, the Caroline divines do not forget the more formal consideration of Catholicity in doctrine. A true Christian is Catholic in intention. He adheres to "the body of Christians which, diffused over the world, retains the faith taught, the discipline settled, the practices appointed by our Lord and His Apostles"(7). Fidelity to the apostolic faith reflects what John Donne beautifully describes as the "universal, Christian, Catholic Church, imaged and conceived and begotten by God in His eternal decree, born and brought to light when He travailed and laboured in those bitter agonies and throes of His passion"(8).

The main notes of this Church are unanimity and fidelity. "We say what Church soever can prove itself to hold the faith once delivered to the saints and generally published to the world without heretical innovation or schismatical violation and breach of the peace and unity of the Christian world, is undoubtedly the true Church of God"(9). These words of Richard Field, a major theologian of the first decade of the century, are constantly echoed. "The Church loves the name of Catholic, and it is a glorious and harmonious name", John Donne assures us, who also adds: "Love thou those things wherein she is Catholic and wherein she is harmonious, that is, *quod ubique, quod semper*, those universal and fundamental doctrines, which in all Christian ages and in all Christian Churches, have been agreed by all to be necessary to salvation; and then thou art a true Catholic"(10). As Donne understands the canon of St Vincent of Lérins, to which he refers, Catholicity constitutes a common core at the heart of all Christian Churches.

Others are more concerned than Donne with the organic structure of Catholicity. There is more to it than Donne seems to believe. John Bramhall echoes the old conception of a progress in doctrine when he defines "the internal communion of the

Christian Catholic Church". The true Catholic "believes the same entire substance of saving necessary truth revealed by the Apostles". This is not all. He is also "ready implicitly in the preparation of his mind to embrace all other supernatural verities when they shall be sufficiently proposed"(11). Jeremy Taylor also asks "that men should hope to be excused by an implicit faith in God almighty"; a true Christian mind is "a mind prepared to consent in that truth which God intended"(12). At this point, the search for Catholicity demands a theology of Tradition. If some truths are now implicitly believed which will some day be explicitly formulated, by what process will these truths come to light? They arise out of the apostolic deposit of faith: 'how' is the question.

Anglican theology is far from unanimous on this matter of tradition. The only theological trends which had any vitality in the English Establishment of the seventeenth century would now be called "High-Church". The Puritans, admittedly, were not excluded from the Church of England before the Restoration. Parliament after Parliament, they plotted to take over the leadership of the Church. Their temporary success through the Revolution should not hide the fact that their theology was never at home in the Church of England. A theology may be called Anglican meaningfully only if it accepts the basis of the Elizabethan settlement, namely, the episcopal structure of the Church. Within these bounds, however, Anglican thought was not clear as to the value of tradition. The dominant school was that of Archbishop William Laud. It was fairly coherent on most points. Yet not all the Laudians envisioned tradition and its place in Catholicity in the same light.)

(Laud himself holds a delicate balance. He is quite certain that the Church can never be wrong on basic points of doctrine. Yet he is equally sure that the Church is not infallible. Looking at his texts closely is rewarding, for it shows him to be more consistent than he appears at first sight. Laud does not do away with the Catholic reliance on the Church's voice. Yet he extols the principle that God alone, and no man, is infallible, while accepting the belief that the Church cannot err.) This (would

imply a self-contradiction, did not Laud watch his vocabulary carefully. For Laud shuns illogicality. He in fact reserves the term 'infallibility' to a direct and immediate intervention of God. In this sense the prophets, the Revelation, the Apostles, were infallible. After the Apostles, however, there has been no such direct intervention of God, and therefore no more infallibility. Yet the Catholic tradition cannot deviate: God guides and preserves it. As this entails no further Revelation, Laud bans the terms 'infallibility' or even 'divine authority' in this connection: "I cannot, no, not in this assisted sense, think the tradition of the present Church divine and infallible." Yet, thanks to the "assistance of Christ and the Blessed Spirit" (13), security remains unimpaired.

This twofold point of view is clearly expressed in a remarkable passage:

This authority [i.e., simply divine] cannot be any testimony or voice of the Church alone. For the Church consists of men subject to error; and no one of them, since the Apostles' times, has been assisted with so plentiful a measure of the Blessed Spirit, as to secure him from being deceived. And all the parts being liable to mistaking, and fallible, the whole cannot possibly be infallible in and of itself, and privileged from being deceived in some things or other. And even in those fundamental things in which the whole universal Church neither does nor can err, yet even there her authority is not divine, because she delivers those supernatural truths by promise of assistance, yet tied to means; and not by any special immediate Revelation, which is necessarily required to the very least degree of divine authority (14).

In Laudian language, the "power of the keys" denotes the Church's authority committed to bishops and pastors "for administration of doctrine and discipline" (15). The "unanimous consent of so many several Churches as exhibited their confessions to the Nicene Council" constitutes, for Thomas Jackson, "a pregnant argument that this faith, wherein they all agreed, had been delivered unto them by the Apostles and their followers" (16). In this Catholic unanimity, "each particular Church was a competent or authentic witness of every other Church's integrity

and fidelity in *servando depositum*, in carefully preserving the truth committed to their special trust"(17). This consensus of tradition may be likened to the consensus of all nations testifying to the existence of God against atheists. It expressed the truth. It cannot go astray. It instances the Church's perfect guidance by Christ and the Spirit. Yet in Laud's carefully-guarded language it entails no gift of prophecy, no new Revelation and no infallibility.

This Anglicanism cannot be called Protestant. It has, on the contrary, preserved, through a rewording, the pre-Reformation concept of the Church's transmitting the deposit of faith.

Other currents, however, run parallel to it through the Laudian school of thought.



The Bishop of Lincoln, Robert Sanderson, was not so impressed by the universal Church as Archbishop Bramhall was. He admitted that "the universal Christian Church here on earth has never failed from the whole faith nor shall ever fail to the world's end"(18). But this is immediately qualified: the universal Church may fail, "not from the whole faith, yet from the purity of faith both in doctrine and worship"(19). This cannot go to the extent that all believers should be misled. Always a small remnant will keep the faith: "There have always been particular men . . . who though living in the midst of corrupt Churches and in the communion and visible profession thereof, have yet according to the measure of their grace and knowledge . . . kept themselves free from the foulest corruptions, though carried with the stream of the common apostasy to embrace the rest"(20).

This is divine protection shrunk to a bare minimum. It hardly tallies with the claim of the Caroline divines to have recovered the patristic conception of the Church. This is not surprising on the part of Sanderson, who shows an intriguing interest in Protestant pre-history: those who held the true and pure faith constituted, at any period, the "Protestant" Church of their time(21). The Church can teach wrong; but God will always inspire protests against its errors.

This quest for a pre-existing Protestantism is not uncommon among Caroline divines. Jeremy Taylor's view of the fallibility of the Church is not far removed from it. Writing from his French exile during the Commonwealth, Taylor opposed, rather than compared, Roman Catholicism and Anglicanism. Many of his formulas have an unmistakable Laudian flavour. "We do not admit the Fathers as infallible, but yet of admirable use; so in the testimony which they give of the doctrines of their forefathers concerning the way of salvation, we give as great credit as can be due to any relator, except Him that is infallible" (22). Although the Fathers are not infallible, their unanimous consensus determines the Catholic faith: "No argument from the authority of the Fathers can prove (a doctrine) Catholic, unless it be universal" (23). Such a universal consent is more negative than positive. It does not require an unequivocal statement from every Father of the Church, only "that there be no dissent from any Fathers equally Catholic and reputed" (23). Taylor realizes that consent may gradually "become universal, that was not so at first" (24). In this case the present Church will judge of the Catholicity of a doctrine: "Unless the whole present do agree, that is, unless of all that are esteemed orthodox there be a present consent, this broken consent is not an infallible testimony of the Catholicism of a doctrine" (24).

We may note Taylor's use of the word "infallible". Taylor emphatically denies infallibility to any council (25). Tradition "is a topic as fallible as any other, so fallible that it cannot be sufficient evidence to any man in a matter of faith or question of heresy" (26). Taylor asserts the "incompetency of the Church, in its diffusive capacity, to be judge of controversies" (27). No man can decide for another whether a belief is Catholic or not. Taylor has thus sided with the protest of the Reformation against authority. Yet there must be some criterion of orthodoxy. Were there none, Taylor could hardly suggest, as above, that a present consent of all that are esteemed orthodox may correct the fallible testimony of the broken consent of the past.

(By a puzzling inconsistency, Jeremy Taylor then restores to every man what he has denied the Church as a whole: the

capacity to judge.) "Here I consider that, although no man may be trusted to judge for all others, unless this person were infallible and authorized so to do, which no man nor no company of men is; yet every man may be trusted to judge for himself, I say, every man that can judge at all"(28). It is very well to state: "Faith is every man's duty and every man's concern and every man's learning"(29). To isolate each person as the sole judge of faith for himself is quite another venture. And why deny the validity for others of a judgment that would be valid for oneself? A decision which is true, is true for all. Or so at least would it seem to common sense. Yet in Taylor's logic no one may pronounce on another's faith. In final analysis, all that may be hoped for is a list of Christians' agreements and disagreements.



On one side of Laud's well-balanced theology, Taylor and several others slide down toward an atomistic view of Catholicity: this may be associated with a more radical Protestantism than the major trend of the Church of England, in the seventeenth century, favoured. On the other side, there is a more decidedly Catholicizing trend than Laud himself represented.

"The Catholic Church can never fail"(30). Whilst all would have agreed, interpretations of this principle would have differed. (Where Archbishop Laud insisted that "infallibility" or "divine authority" was no attribute of the nevertheless unfailing Church, Archbishop Bramhall brushed false problems aside:)

The question is not whether the Catholic Church can make new essentials, but whether it can declare old essentials. Not whether the canons of the universal Church of this age have divine authority, but whether they do oblige Christians in conscience, and whether it be not temerarious presumption for a particular person or Church to slight the belief or practice of the universal Church of all succeeding ages(31).

(Laud's objection to infallibility was largely a matter of wording. But it is the meaning that matters, not the language. To Bramhall's mind, Catholicity means that the Church wields authority.)

Paying lip-service to the primitive Church leaves him unsatisfied. For the Catholic Church of the present day enjoys like authority. As Bramhall understands it, the Church of England enjoins "readiness in the preparation of our minds to believe and practise whatsoever the Catholic Church, even of this present age, does universally believe and practise"(32). Like Taylor and Laud, he blasts the notion of a "virtual" Church, namely, that "one person has in himself eminently and virtually as much certainty of truth and infallibility of judgment as the universal Church"(33). But what he denies the Pope, Bramhall grants the Church: "We acknowledge the *representative* Church, that is, a General Council, and the *essential* Church, that is, the multitude of believers, either of all ages, which make the symbolic Church, or of this age, which make the present Catholic Church"(33).

Schism is a rejection of this collective authority. It is a major sin which soon turns into a hotbed of heresy. For schismatics wallow in quicksands, having forsaken the only stable point of reference. "Having once deserted the Catholic communion, they find no beaten path to walk in, but are like men running down a steep hill, that cannot stay themselves; or like sick persons, that toss and turn themselves continually from one side of their bed to the other, searching for that repose which they do not find"(34).

Of all the major Caroline divines, Archbishop Bramhall comes closest to the pre-Reformation conception of Catholicity. The difference dwindles almost to disappearance between his views and those which had been entertained, in the late medieval Church, in conciliaristic circles. Although Bramhall wrote his main works in France during the Commonwealth, he continued a tradition which existed in the English Church before the Puritan Revolution. Godfrey Goodman (1583-1656), Bishop of Gloucester, may not be a good representative of this Catholic trend, for he was not followed on his more or less secret path to Rome. Yet his case shows how Catholic one could be in the Caroline Church. When Goodman's will was opened, the suspicions of many were confirmed: this Anglican bishop had been a crypto-Roman Catholic. In this testament Goodman declared

himself to be "most constant in all the doctrines of God's holy and apostolic Church, whereof I do acknowledge the Church of Rome to be the Mother Church. And I do verily believe that no other Church has any salvation in it, but only so far as it concurs with the faith of the Church of Rome"(35). Goodman had been in frequent conflict with Laud, who was wary of his Roman leanings.

Meanwhile, the Catholic idea made headway in another quarter. The men that we have met so far were only reflecting the Catholicity to which they thought the Church of England committed, in its doctrine, its worship and its organization. Yet there is more to Catholicity than the seventeenth-century Church of England. Richard Montague (1578-1641), who was Bishop successively of Chichester and of Norwich, was an outstanding patristic scholar. His writings made it a rule to abide by the Fathers: "The warrant and authority of the holy Fathers, that is, the practice and tradition of the Church shall regulate, I promise you, my resolution and settle my judgment"(36). The case for the Church's inerrancy is well put by Montague in a passage which deserves to be quoted in full in spite of its length:

Particular and topical Churches have erred (such may then, and can, even in fundamentals) and so ceased to be any more Churches. . . . But as touching the Catholic Church, take this from me: the Catholic Church includes two things, universality of time and place both, or universality of place only. In the former acception take the Church; and that *coetus evocatus*, which has been heretofore and which is now, make it up. The Apostles, their disciples, all their successors are included. And so the Catholic Church has not, did not, cannot, err, either in fact or faith, fundamental or less fundamental. In the second acception, according to universality of place, the Catholic Church of Christ is twofold, *diffusive* or *representative*; in every part and member of it, in every place; or in some special parts, in one place, a General Council for the whole, or all particulars that make up the whole. The Catholic Church at this day cannot err in all her parts, nor *in faciendis*, matter of fact, nor *in credendis*, points of belief, dangerously. The Church representative, true and lawful, never yet erred in fundamentals; and therefore I see no cause but to vouch, she cannot err in fundamentals (37).

This undoubtedly marks a step back to the patristic view on the unerring Church. As it happened, this patristic concept which is, with Bishop Montague, well on the way to being restored, was also the medieval and the Tridentine idea.



These diverging standpoints on the value of tradition arise from differing views of the rule of faith. All the Anglicans, following the patristic and medieval problematic, reduce the rule of faith to Holy Scripture. From the heavily Protestant theology of Richard Field to the Catholic doctrine of Richard Montague, all are agreed on this score. They also recognize that Scripture cannot be understood aright without the guidance of tradition. Bramhall stands for the entire Caroline theology when he writes: "The Scriptures and the Creed are not two different rules of faith, but one and the same rule, dilated in the Scripture, contracted in the Creed"(38). Bramhall explains further that the authority of the Creed implies that of the first four Councils, where the Creed was determined.)

Some of the Caroline divines would implicitly trust Councils. Others are more stringent. They emphasize that Holy writ is the sole source of conciliar authority. Accordingly one need not only go to the Councils to find the truth; one must also check the Councils' method of defining the truth. This procedure is advocated, among others, by Thomas Jackson: "Into the same truths which these Councils were then, we now are, led, not by relying upon the sole authority of the Councils which the Spirit did lead, but by tracing their footsteps, and viewing the way by which the Spirit did lead them"(39). Yet the main point is granted all along: "They are but interpreters of the law; they are not absolute to make such a law." This is Montague's qualification of conciliar authority(40). Field likewise finds a "most certain and infallible" rule in "the Scripture, or the written word of God, expounded according to the rule of faith, practice of the saints, and the due comparing of one part with another, in the public confession of faith published by the Churches of our communion"(41).

The function of today's Church in explaining Scripture is not so easily assessed. That the universal Church does not err requires clarification. For where is this universal Church? And who speaks for her?

Richard Field explicitly warns that acceptance of today's Church as a bearer of authority leads to Roman Catholicism. In order to eschew such a dreadful eventuality, the present episcopal doctrine is to be checked and corrected by reference to the unanimous testimony of the past. "I never make the judgment and opinion of the present bishops of apostolical Churches to be the rule to know true traditions by; but deny it, and profess the contrary against the papists, and make only the testimony of the pastors of apostolical Churches successively from the beginning witnessing the same thing, to be the rule of this kind"(42). William Laud, who is not so scared of Rome, takes one further step: "We go to the tradition of the present Church and by it, as well as you do," does he write to his opponent, Mr Fisher the Jesuit, "Here we differ: we use the tradition of the present Church as the first motive, not as the last resolution, of our faith. We resolve only into prime apostolical and Scripture itself"(43). When Scripture and apostolic doctrine do not clear up the matter, then "the moral persuasion, reason and force of the present Church is ground enough to move any reasonable man"(44). Laud applies this principle to the reception of Scripture as the word of God: we know the Bible to be the word of God on the authority of the Church today. This being granted, there is no reason to deprive the Church of "persuasion, reason and force" regarding less fundamental points of doctrine.

It is true that all Fathers do not wield like authority. "There is an immense difference between the Apostles and the Fathers; and among the Fathers themselves; and between the Fathers and us" (45). As Lancelot Andrewes wisely adds, this does not impair the Church's reliability: the Church is always trustworthy, "but not so the truthfulness of men, either in convening [Councils] or in drawing up decrees"(46). On this ground Henry Hammond begs us to trust and yet to distrust the testimony of Churches of apostolic origin:

It is true indeed that whatsoever one Church professes to have received from the Apostles that planted it, is of itself sufficient, without the confirmation of all others, to beget and establish belief in him to whom it thus testifies. . . . But this is no further to be extended than while we suppose without enquiry that other apostolical Churches have received, and are ready to testify, the same; which presumption or supposal must then cease, when upon inquiry we find the contrary(47).

This would be practical and handy, could one easily ascertain which churches are of apostolical origin.



There is a Caroline solution to this problem. It is simple, perhaps too simple. But it has the advantage of being based on the Church's structure: all episcopal Churches are apostolical. Bishops have succeeded the Apostles.

Bramhall drives this point home very ably: "Catholic and anti-episcopal are contradictory terms"(48). The Caroline divines commonly include episcopacy in their definition of the Church. "The Church is a society of believers, ruled and continued . . . under bishops or pastors succeeding those on whom the Holy Ghost came down"(49). Bishops enjoy supreme ecclesiastical authority. Each of them is, *qua* bishop, responsible for the entire Catholic Church, and this by divine right, even though he is more immediately in charge of one diocese. This is at least Crakanthorpe's considered opinion(50). Bramhall, who is less adventuresome in his theology, sticks more closely to medieval conciliarism: "As single bishops are the heads of particular Churches, so episcopacy, that is, a General Council, or ecumenical assembly of bishops, is the head of the universal Church"(51). The main point is saved in any case: episcopacy belongs by divine right to the essence of the Church.

Modern discussions have questioned the status of bishops in the Anglican tradition. Is episcopacy of the *esse*, the *bene esse* or the *plenius esse* of the Church? In other words, does it pertain to the essence or only to the better organization of the

Church? Most Caroline divines dare not unchurch non-episcopal communions, and they therefore hold *esse* and *bene esse* of the Church, her "being" and her "integrity", in a delicate, sometimes precarious, balance. But does it follow that in their eyes episcopacy is superfluous? Far from it. The common view among the seventeenth-century Anglicans affirms first that every Catholic Church must be episcopal. It then recognizes the fact that some non-episcopal bodies are not deprived of every mark of a Church: the word is still preached and sacraments are still administered. It accordingly suspends judgment: who are we to damn those through whom the Holy Spirit condescends to work, in spite of their not following the God-given order of the Church? Excuses could be found for the opposition of Continental Protestants to episcopacy, although Montague, Bramhall and even Jeremy Taylor were not inclined to leniency.

Thus episcopacy was maintained, with a proviso. This was no double-talk. It was only one case of the dimming of Catholicity, which Isaac Casaubon styled "the peculiar and famous calamity of these latter times"(52). As seen by Casaubon, Catholicity had for centuries followed a law of diminishing returns. Not only had episcopacy waned in many areas. Catholicity, moreover, had become less and less visible everywhere. Since the separation of East and West, of "the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the Church of Antioch and of Egypt, the Abyssine, the Muscovite and many others", the Catholic Church has become "less manifest, being divided into many parts"(53). Once upon a time, Richard Field remarks, "the name of a Catholic was a note and distinctive mark or character to know and discern a Catholic from a heretic or a schismatic by"(54). Now, however, whether it is orthodox or heretic, every part of the broken unity claims Catholicity. In such an entangled situation, only those who are utterly void of tokens of Catholicity are excluded from the Catholic Church. Others, who are marked by the sign of true doctrine, though bereft of the sign of episcopacy, are not entirely outside the pale. When Bramhall concluded, "We exclude all those whom undoubted General Councils have excluded; the rest we leave to God, and to the determination of a free Council

as general as may be"(55), he did not abandon episcopacy as the divine structure of the Church; he only adopted a prudential position until such a time as a safe judgment could be passed.

This implies a mixed view of the non-episcopal Protestant Churches. It joins approval (where these Churches teach the pure Gospel) to condemnation (where they reject episcopacy or other basic points of doctrine) and condescension (leaving them to God's judgment). Bramhall has little patience with Presbyterians, whom he regards as well-intentioned but misguided souls. Secure, however, in "the universal and perpetual tradition of the Catholic Church of Christ", he takes of the new-fangled sects of his century a charitable view which is far from flattering for the sectaries: "And for the other sects, it were much better to have a little patience and to suffer them to die of themselves, than to trouble the world so much about them; they were produced in a storm and will die in a calm. . . . It is honour enough for them to be named in earnest by a polemic writer"(56).

Admittedly, there were examples in the seventeenth century of Presbyterian ordinations recognized as valid in the Church of England. Some Anglicans also received communion in Continental Protestant Churches. Bishop Cosin himself did so during the Interregnum, when he developed friendly relations with French Calvinists. Yet these remained exceptional cases. The Church of England as a whole did not pass judgment on Lutheran or Calvinist organizations, of which it neither approved nor disapproved. Holding fast to the apostolic rule of episcopal ordination, it next suspended its judgment regarding other practices, in the hope that Continental Protestants would mend their ways and return to apostolic practice.

★

The present Catholic Church, as seen by the Caroline divines, is formed of all the Churches that have preserved the apostolic order with the apostolic doctrine. One may hesitate as to the status of schismatics and heretics. Yet in the main the Anglican principle is clear: the Catholic order is made of "co-ordinate

Churches, whereof one is not subordinate to another", all of them owing "their duty to the Ecumenical Church and its representative, a General Council"(57). In terms of time, the Catholic Church is marked by continuity or succession. Her doctrine springs "from a primitive fountain, and is descended in the stream of Catholic uninterrupted succession"(58).

That the Church of England has faithfully kept Catholic continuity is a fundamental assertion of all our writers. Andrewes states it succinctly: "We plead there is no interruption in the succession of our Church"(59). "We derive our Church," Bramhall claims, "our religion, our holy orders, from Christ and His Apostles by an uninterrupted succession"(60). This theme constantly recurs.

The Caroline divines grounded the evidence for this on the continuity of episcopal jurisdiction in England. They also argued from the correspondence of their Eucharistic conceptions with those of the patristic and medieval Church. Lancelot Andrewes thus believed, with Cardinal du Perron, that "the Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a sacrament and as a sacrifice"(61). Anglican theologians continued to protest transubstantiation. The most Catholic of them, however, held an equivalent doctrine. Andrewes, for one, admitted that all the patristic "witnesses speak of mutation, immutation, transmutation". He added: "As for ourselves, we do not deny this preposition *trans* here, and we grant that the elements are transmuted"(62). At the end of the century, George Bull (1634-1710), Bishop of St Davids, also recognized that "We are not ignorant that the ancient Fathers generally teach that the bread and wine in the Eucharist, by or upon the consecration of them, do become and are made the Body and Blood of Christ"(63). The word "transubstantiation" is not conceded; yet the doctrine is equivalently accepted.

On this basis, the Anglican apologists countered the Roman Catholic argument that the English Reformers had altered the Catholic Eucharistic doctrine. Knowing the Anglican belief of their time, they read it back into the recent past. Thomas Jackson spoke for all of them when he maintained "that our forefathers

at the time of their departure from the Romish Church were true Catholics or, in the interim between the abandoning of the prelacy of Rome and the establishing a prelacy or form of government of their own, more refined, were visible members of the holy Catholic Church"(64). It was for them a matter of history that "the Church of England before the Reformation and the Church of England after the Reformation are as much the same Church as a garden, before it is weeded and after it is weeded, is the same garden"(65). Accordingly, the Church of England, as seen by the seventeenth-century Anglican divines, has always abode, and still dwells, within the Catholic communion. This provides the main topic of Casaubon's *Anglican Catholicity Vindicated*. The entire theology of the Laudians would be unintelligible without this assumption.

Yet schism undermines Catholicism. (Our writers throw back on Rome the responsibility of discord between Rome and Canterbury.) They testify that the Church of England has no schismatic will. King James I "is as much grieved as any many for the distraction of the members of the Church, so much abhorred by the holy Fathers, and as earnestly desires to communicate, if it were possible, with all that are members of the mystical Body of our Lord Jesus Christ". Yet the Church "will more esteem of the love of truth than the love of unity"(66). On the one hand, the Protestant Churches, deprived as they are of the episcopal order, suffer from their lack of "integrity". They are, to that extent, schismatical. On the other hand, the Church of Rome is a true Church from a "metaphysical"(67) point of view, retaining as it does the "essentials of a Church". It still is one of the five patriarchal Churches(68). Yet it teaches errors.

On this count some Anglicans go further than others in their condemnation of the Papacy. Crakanthorpe nicknames the Church of Rome a Church, but only in the sense of "a herd of donkeys"(69). Bishop Sanderson calls her not a "true Christian Church"(70). Thomas Jackson blandly asserts: "No reason they should be termed Catholics at all"(71).

Others are more conciliatory. Bishop Richard Montague is "absolutely persuaded, and shall be till I see cause to the contrary

that the Church of Rome is a true, though not a sound, Church of Christ, as well since as before the Council of Trent; a part of the Catholic Church, though not the Catholic Church which we do profess to believe in our Creed"(72). James I, interpreted by Casaubon, "will acknowledge his Primacy and be willing to say with Gregory Nazianzen that he has the care of the whole Church", if only "the Bishop of Rome [would] declare evidently by his actions that he seeks God's glory, not his own, that he has a care of the peace and salvation of his people"(73). Bramhall would recognize "his Protopatriarchate, and the dignity of an apostolical Bishop and his Primacy of order, so long as the Church thought fit to continue it to that See, if this would content him" (74). With unguarded innocence, Sir Roger Twysden finds no reason why one could not be Anglican and Roman Catholic at the same time: "For aught I know, [the English Bishops] might have acknowledged [the Papal Primacy] so far as is expressed or deduced from Holy Scripture, or laid down in the ancient sacred Councils or the constant writings of the orthodox primitive Fathers, and yet done what they did"(75).

At any rate, schism has not been consummated. To the best of Bramhall's knowledge, the Church of England has never excommunicated "Papists in gross, *qua tales*, but only some particular Papists, who were either convicted of other crimes, or found guilty of contumacy"(76). As a view of English history, this would be hardly accurate. As a pointer to Bramhall's feelings, it is significant. Between Rome and Canterbury there has taken place what Jeremy Taylor thinks is a lawful separation, but no final schism. For neither Rome nor Canterbury has broken its ties with episcopacy. This alone would be "the quintessence and spirit of schism, and a direct overthrow to Christianity and a confronting of a divine institution"(77).

Though Rome may teach errors, it does not reject the Catholic faith. "Nothing is held as a point of faith in our Church, but the present Romish Church does hold the same, and confess the same to have been held by all orthodox antiquity"(78). On account of Roman errors, "external communion" has been suspended. On the basis of the Catholic faith still present in Rome, "internal

communion", which alone is "of absolute necessity among all Catholics", continues unbroken. This at least is Bramhall's distinction(79). In his view, the Church of England has not deserted Rome in so far as Rome is Catholic, but only in proportion as it teaches errors. "Whosoever does separate himself from any part of the Catholic Church as it is a part of the Catholic Church does separate himself from every part of the Catholic Church and consequently from the universal Church, which has no existence but in his parts"(80). But this has not been the case here. The corruptions of the Church of Rome, and not her essence as a Church, have been renounced. A Church which, for a valid motive, separates itself from another "does still retain a communion, not only with the Catholic Church and with all the orthodox members of the Catholic Church, but even with that corrupted Church from which it is separated, except only in corruptions"(80).

That England has sloughed off Roman errors without being estranged from Rome as a part of the Catholic Church constitutes a common theme of Anglican theology under the Stuart kings. For Bramhall, the Church of England holds "an actual communion with all the divided parts of the Christian world in most things *et in voto*, according to our desires, in all things"(81). Montague put a like limit to valid separation: "In essentials and in fundamentals they agree, holding one faith in one Lord, into whom they are inserted through baptism. . . . And I verily am persuaded that I ought not to go farther from the Church of Rome in these her worst days than she has gone away from herself in her best days"(82). Laud himself, Archbishop of Canterbury though he was, looked to the Church of Rome as to an elder sister:

Rome and other national Churches are in this universal Catholic house as so many daughters to whom, under Christ, the care of the household is committed by God the Father and the Catholic Church, the Mother of all Christians. Rome as an elder sister, but not the eldest neither, had a great care committed unto her, in and from the prime times of the Church, and to her Bishop in her; but at this time, (to let pass some branches that had formerly been in the house)

England and some other sisters of her have fallen out in the family. What then? Will the Father and the Mother, God and the Church, cast one child out because another is angry with it?(83).

Laud's somewhat mixed metaphors make at least his thought clear.

In thus viewing Rome as an elder sister which is unreasonably angry with England, Laud may have been reminiscent of John Donne's early protest: "And of that Church which is departed from us, disunited by an opinion of a necessity that all should be united in one form, and that theirs is it, since they keep their right foot fast upon the Rock Christ, I dare not pronounce that she is not our sister"(84).



We are thus led to a final point. What is, in the eyes of the Caroline divines, the Church of England? The answer stems from the preceding pages. The Church of England has gone astray, they believe, neither to the left, with the Puritans, nor to the right, with the Romans. She has found "the mean betwixt both said extremes . . . this mean bearing the true portraiture and lineaments of God's own ordinance". This passage of Bishop John Overall's *Convocation Book* of 1606(85) is often echoed. Laud is proud of this achievement of the Church of England; yet he cannot hide a note of sadness: "She is between these two factions as between two millstones"(86). In the more tragic circumstances of his own trial he was to repeat: "Truth usually lies between two extremes, and is beaten by both, as the poor Church of England is at this day by the Papist and the separatist"(87).

Most authors see this medial position as the peculiar glory of the Church of England. She stands in the middle because she is the most Catholic Church on the face of the earth. To Casaubon King James confided: "If question be made concerning the essential marks of the Church, or if you look at those things which are plainly necessary to salvation, or respect order and decency in the Church, you shall not find a Church in the whole world (God be praised for it) more approaching to the faith and fashion

of the ancient Catholic. His Majesty excepts none"(88). Laud also believed that to "any indifferent reader, that religion, as it is professed in the Church of England, is nearest of any Church now in being to the primitive Church"(89).

The excellency of the Church of England directly results from its restoration of Catholicity. Thus Thomas Jackson claims: "The three special notes of the Catholic faith or Church... universality, antiquity and consent... agree to us, not to the Romanists"(90). To Cardinal Bellarmine Lancelot Andrewes quietly retorts: "We are renovators, not novators"(91). The Anglican faith, he continues, is "from the standpoint of extension, as Catholic as yours, from that of the age, more and much more Catholic than yours"(92). On the strength of this conviction, John Traske could, in 1616, entitle a book: *Christ's Kingdom Discovered, or That the True Church of God is in England*. Richard Field as well as Richard Montague, Jeremy Taylor like John Bramhall, William Laud and Thomas Jackson: all untiringly harp back on "the ancient religion preserved"(93) in the Church of England. All are convinced with John Bramhall that they may sincerely profess: "We do not challenge a new Church, a new religion, a new holy Orders; but derive our Church, our religion, our holy Orders, from Christ and His Apostles by an uninterrupted succession"(94). Their common allegiance goes, through the Church of England, to the Catholic Church as preserved along the lines of episcopal succession and holding fast the faith of the first centuries. In a word, they consider themselves unalterably bound to a universal communion which is Catholic in faith and episcopal in structure, "this great and glorious total and corporation"(95).

This is not to say that these "High-Churchmen" of the seventeenth century felt equally happy about all members of the Anglican communion. Not everyone, in the Church of England, shared their views. Puritan sentiment was widespread. The restoration of 1662 was indeed carried out along the lines of Laudian theology. But many Anglican clergy had conformed to the Puritan order during the Commonwealth. Their proportion may have reached seventy per cent of the parishes(96). Even

though most of these conforming parishes must have been small country churches, with little more than a local influence, this is a considerable percentage. Allowing for the cruel dilemma they were in, conforming priests cannot have felt very warm in their Anglican allegiance. They had been marked by Puritanism. The reverse movement took place after the Restoration. Many Puritan ministers were inducted during the Commonwealth in the parishes left vacant by the exiled Anglicans. Their fortune having veered and their own turn arrived for a showdown, a great number of them asked for, and received, episcopal ordination. They then continued their ministry in the restored Church of England. Surely, these men did not shed their Presbyterian or Independent ideas overnight. They bowed more or less under duress, waiting, in vain this time, for happier days. The Anglican Establishment thus remained, after the Restoration, what it was before, a doctrinally mixed body.

High-Churchmen were not blind to this. John Bramhall, one of the most Catholic of them, excused it on grounds of charity and expediency. The following text, which he wrote during the Commonwealth, could well have been taken as a programme for the leniency of the Restoration toward Presbyterians:

I do readily acknowledge that it is the duty of each orthodox Church to excommunicate formal heretics and them who swerve from the Apostles' Creed as the rule of faith; but this does not oblige the Church of England to excommunicate all material heretics, who follow the dictate of their conscience in inferior questions which are not essentials of faith, and do hold the truth explicitly in the preparation of their minds(97).

This "comprehensiveness" was at the furthest remove from the ecumenical ideal that more recent Anglicans have made of it. It was a bare tolerance of individual heretics in the hope that communion within a Catholic institution might lead misguided souls to the full truth.

Be that as it may, the dominant theology in the first two-thirds of the seventeenth century was more reminiscent of that of Stephen Gardiner than of the thought of Thomas Cranmer.

The situation, admittedly, had changed since the dangerous days of Henry VIII and Edward VI, and more serenity was possible. The Protestant resurgence under the Commonwealth shattered this serenity and partly pushed representative High-Churchmen to extreme positions as soon as they were able to speak openly, while moderate Puritans found themselves turning towards the other extreme.

Chapter Four

THE RESTORATION

That there is no such thing as a Church by God's law in the nature of a body . . . is opposite to an article of my Creed, who always thought myself a member of such a body by being of the Church of England.—Herbert Thorndike.

THE Restoration of the episcopal Church of England in 1662 marked the return to power of Caroline theology. This belated triumph of Laud's conceptions was all but wholly engineered by the "High-Church party" in exile. In the darkest hours of their sojourn as refugees in Roman Catholic France, the Laudians used their leisure to elaborate the treatises that have provided the core of our documentation for the foregoing chapter. We need not deal here with their cautious re-entry into England and the diplomatic game that was played before Charles II finally achieved what had been his goal from the outset, the Restoration of the episcopal structure of the Establishment. This period is theologically important in so far as Caroline theology at last came into its own. Instead of remaining the theological conspiracy which it forcibly was during the Interregnum, it now dominated the scene. But let us not be fooled by this official victory. It was a diplomatic success, but it left the Presbyterians theologically unconvinced and emotionally resentful. The Puritan champions could well yield to might and be treated as the poor relations of the Church of England, their ideas were unchanged.

Furthermore, not all tribulations were over for the Church itself. James II, who succeeded his brother Charles in 1685, was a militant Roman Catholic. He naturally favoured his co-religionists. Had he been soft-handed and of a diplomatic bent, he might have avoided catastrophe. The bishops on the whole were not averse to obeying a Roman Catholic King, as long as their spiritual

liberties were respected. James, however, promptly antagonized everybody.) By 1688, (many lay readers and churchmen were persuaded, rightly or wrongly, but more probably wrongly, that the King planned to restore Roman Catholicism. This would have tolled the knell of both the Anglican Establishment and the Presbyterian hopes of better days. The result was the revolution of 1688: James II was ousted, practically without a fight. William of Orange, husband to James's Protestant sister Mary, ascended the throne.)

The Anglican bishops were then faced with a dilemma. (Though a Dutch Protestant, William was disposed to protect episcopacy, should only the bishops support him against the claims of James. But the bishops had all taken an oath of allegiance to James: could they now in conscience forswear themselves and take a similar oath to William and Mary?)

The story of the ensuing events is well known. (The Archbishop of Canterbury, Sancroft, declined to take the new oath. He was followed by Bishops Framden, of Gloucester, Ken, of Bath and Wells, Lloyd, of Norwich, Turner, of Ely and White, of Peterborough and by the totality of the Scottish bishops.) The others bowed before William and Mary, and they soothed their conscience with a legal excuse: the real purpose of the oath was to bind their loyalty to the actual King of the realm, not to the person of an exiled king.

The resulting situation was confused. Yet this was not yet what historians call the High-Church, or the Non-Jurors' schism. There would have been no schism had William respected the spiritual freedom of the Church. But he wanted a compliant bench of bishops, and he was no man to bide his time. In 1690 he suspended the non-juring bishops and replaced them by less unbending persons. In William's mind this was a political action. For theologians reared in Laudian theology, this was a schismatic act on the part of the King: the bishops whom he inducted into the sees of the Non-Jurors were schismatics. Those who communicated with them were schismatics. In a word the genuine historical Church of England was that of the Non-Juring bishops and their followers. The Establishment, official though it were, formed a schismatic sect.

The relevance of these events to our purpose is this: the Non-Jurors were High-Churchmen with a High-Church theology. Their protest marked a climax in the development of the Catholic party in the Church of England. Politically, they lost control of the Church. William first and, when the Stuart succession came to an end, in its non-Roman Catholic line, with the death of Queen Anne, the Hanover kings, took care to raise Low-Churchmen to the episcopate. But theologically, they gained: under the pressure of events their theology reached heights which the Carolines had not approached. With this we must now deal. Rather than survey the Non-Jurors in general, however, we will select the thought of the greatest of them in the field of theological writing, Henry Dodwell (1641-1711).

Between the main group of the Caroline divines and the Non-Jurors, there looms a prominent figure. One of the Commonwealth exiles, Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672) was notorious for his dissatisfaction with the Restoration. Starting, like his colleagues, from the basis of Caroline theology, he advanced further than most of them did in the direction of a Catholic Restoration. His works thus build a bridge between the Laudian school in general and the Non-Jurors. We will therefore begin with Herbert Thorndike.



Herbert Thorndike fights on three fronts. Against Hobbes's philosophy he maintains that the Church is and must be a spiritual society independent of secular power. Against the sects, Independents and Presbyterians, he sticks to the Catholic conception of the Church as a visible society with a continuous episcopal structure derived from the Apostles. Against the Recusants he believes that the authority of the See of Rome does not extend to the entire Church and implies no infallibility.

His starting-point is that of Anglicanism in general: the Anglican Church has restored, or tried to restore, primitive Catholicity, the order of the primitive Church, before papal accretions had corrupted it. His antagonism to both non-episcopal Protestantism and Rome is summed up in this principle: a

Reformation must be "the restoring of that Church which has been, not the building of that which has not been"(1). (Thorndike's main work, his *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*, published in 1659, precisely defines the conditions of such a Reformation. A bulky study which totals six volumes in the *Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology*, it first describes the "principles of Christian truth" along Catholic lines, these being epitomized in apostolic succession. It then destroys the basis of Puritan theology with a thorough study of the true nature of the "Covenant of grace". It finally goes into details concerning the "laws of the Church", that is, the sacraments, government and ceremonies of a truly Catholic Church.)

Thorndike, however, does not deal with abstractions. The Church which he wants to bring back to primitive Catholicity is the Church in England. From this standpoint he is not satisfied with the English Reformation. "It is evident that there are four forms of Reformation extant: one according to Luther, another according to Calvin, the third is that of the Church of England, and in the last place . . . I name that of the Union in Bohemia"(2). Of the three non-English forms, the Bohemian is to be preferred, since it has better preserved the Catholic pattern. (As for the Church of England, its laws are indeed "the laws of the primitive Catholic Church"(3). This at least was the goal of the English Reformation. Yet, as a point of fact, this purpose was not carried through to the end.)

★

(Comparing the Church of England of his time with the primitive Church, Thorndike finds a major difference: the Church of England makes no use of the power of the keys, either to reconcile sinners or to excommunicate heretics. This alone is a blow to those who maintain the validity of its Catholic Reformation:) "So long as the keys of the Church are not in force, that is, in use, for the restoring of sinners to communion upon presumption that they are restored in grace, grounded upon the works of repentance which they show, it is a hard task to maintain the claim of Reformation in the Church"(4). And elsewhere:

"Certainly, the Church of England is not the Church of England but in name till the power of excommunication be restored in it"(5).

Another notable divergence between the primitive Catholic Church and the Anglican communion lies in the Anglican attitude to Rome. Thorndike indeed opposes Rome's claim to infallibility. Yet in primitive times Rome wielded an authority which the present Church of England denies. Moreover, reflecting on the implications of the English Reformation, Thorndike concludes that the recognition of Rome as a truly Catholic Church is logically entailed by the Anglican claim of historical continuity. When Anglicans are asked, "Where was your Church before Luther's time?", they answer that it was where it now is, but then sick and now in health. "This answer", Thorndike comments, "supposes that the Church of Rome was a true Church when that change which we call the Reformation was made; and therefore grants, as it has always been granted, that so it is at present"(6.)

On this basis Thorndike refutes common anti-Roman arguments. Contrary to what many Anglicans and Puritans assert, the Pope has never been, is not, and cannot be, Antichrist(7). For if he were, his Church would never have been a true Church, and the Church of England now would not be a true Church. In the same vein, the accusation of idolatry is rejected. There is no idolatry in any teaching and practice of Roman Catholics, and least of all in Eucharistic worship. "The Flesh and Blood of Christ is no idol to Christians, wheresoever it is worshipped"(8). In other words, adversaries of Rome set up a straw man; their arguments miss the true Rome, unrecognizable in the caricature they draw.

(The relation of the Church of England to Rome ought to be what it was before corruptions crept in. In early centuries Rome has special importance and was granted pre-eminence in the Church. England itself, after its conversion, owed Rome "the respect which was due to their Mother-Church"(9). Not only England, but all Western Churches also recognized the Roman pre-eminence. This should be restored:) "The Church of Rome has,

and ought to have, where it shall please to hear reason, a regular pre-eminence over the rest of Christendom in these Western parts. And he that is able to judge and willing to consider, shall find that pre-eminence the only reasonable means to preserve so great a body in unity"(10). For Rome is basically the same as ever it was. It is sound in doctrine: "I must and do freely profess, that I find no position necessary to salvation prohibited, none destructive to salvation enjoined to be believed, by it"(11). It has preserved historical continuity: "There can no question be made, that it continues the same visible body by the succession of its pastors and laws . . . that first was founded by the Apostles"(11). (If such is Rome, why not join it and thereby restore the full order of the primitive Catholic Church?)

★

(At this point Thorndike lands in a dilemma.) He is well aware of the deficiencies of the English Reformation. Henry VIII never truly desired to reform the Church: "It is manifest that he left not the See of Rome upon any pretence of reforming religion"(12). Instead, Henry perpetuated corruptions: "The usurpations of the See of Rome . . . were all re-invested in (the Church)"(13). No longer exacted by papal legates, abuses were wrought by Henry's agents. Under his rule, the Church of England sailed away from Charybdis towards Scylla.

(As for the Elizabethan Reformation, it was obviously forced on the Church by secular power against the will of the bishops. This is particularly true of the way episcopal succession was secured by the Queen: "It is manifest that the ordinations by which that Order is propagated in England, at and since the Reformation, were not made by consent of the greater part of the Bishops of each Province, but against their mind. . . . And by the same means it is manifest that all those ecclesiastical laws by which the Reformation was established in England were not made by a consent capable to oblige the Church. . . ." These laws were imposed by the Crown. Such an intervention into the spiritual freedom of the Church is "contrary to that rule wherein the unity of the Church consists", namely, contrary to govern-

ment by bishops(14). This is not all. In its doctrinal statements the Reformation was deficient. It did not even proceed "expressly upon profession of one visible Church, though neither denying nor questioning the same"(15).

(The Reformation cannot be reversed.) Yet if we have to accept the outcome and should refrain from judging those who were responsible for breaches of Christian discipline, we should not condone the means by which the Reformation was carried through. At any rate, what was then begun was not pushed to its end. The Reformation failed to restore all the primitive pattern of Catholicity. And why? "What is the reason why so godly a desire of so evident a Reformation could not take place?" There is plainly but one answer: "I shall not much labour to persuade him who shall consider the tares of Puritanism to have been sowed together with the grain of Reformation in the Church of England"(16). Whatever could have been done that was left undone, the Church has now been punished for its neglect of primitive Catholicity. The exile, this "tragedy of the Church of England", was the normal outcome of so ill-starred a beginning: "Shall we not think that the neglect of perfecting the Reformation begun . . . is and ought to be taken for the ground of that reckoning which God has made with us?"(17).

(Thorndike's dilemma lies exactly here: the English Reformation is not satisfactory since it falls short of primitive Catholicity; but union with Rome is impossible on account of Roman usurpations.) Rome has usurped temporal authority(18). It claims infallibility for the present-day Church, whereas infallibility resides only in the totality of the Church of all times(19). Applying this premise to the case in hand, Rome demands reconciliation "upon terms of conquest"(20). This simplifies the apologetics of Roman zealots and gives them a marked advantage over Anglican apologists(21). But is it fair? It takes no account, as Thorndike explains, of the Catholicity that has survived in England. It spurns the rights of English bishops to reform their dioceses according to the primitive pattern even if Rome, burdened with accretions, opposes such a Reformation. In these conditions England cannot bow to Rome without perpetuating the Roman

decadence. The onus for this impasse lies with Rome. Therefore "it is the best plea that we shall have for ourselves at the day of judgment, why we continue divided from them; that they give us no appearance of hope that they will condescend to any such terms (as may restore unity, preserving and improving, as much as may be, the common Christianity)"(22).



Thorndike holds definite views regarding the necessary conditions for a reconciliation with Rome. Should England terminate its Catholic Reformation, finally restore primitive Catholicity in its integrity, Rome would find itself forced to yield and accept unity. "Such a change would clear us from all imputation of schism with the Church of Rome. Such a change would produce that improvement of Christianity which the name of Reformation pretends. The Church of Rome would have no cause to laugh at such a change; unless they would laugh for joy at that improvement of that common Christianity"(23). No restoration of the "primitive right of the Church" would be offensive to Rome(24). For it would help to purify Rome itself. England should therefore seek for "the sense and practice of the whole Church": when this is done "we are halfway onward to the point of Reformation, having the ground and the reason and therefore the measure and the terms of it"(25).

This "whole Church" is the Church of all times, the only one which is infallible, and not the Church of any given period. Yet one period will provide the standard of what the whole Church believes. Because its orthodoxy is unquestioned by any Catholic, whether Eastern or Western, the Church of the first six Councils, previous to any separation between East and West will remain the touchstone of Catholicity: "All interpretation of Scripture, all Reformation of the Church as concerning the government of the Church, is to be confined within the consent of the whole Church, expressed in the decrees of those Councils and the canons in force during that time"(26). The Church of England's vocation is to reach beyond East and West, to return to the Catholic order as it thrived before schism started: "The

Reformation, having no interest in [that schism], ought to claim the inheritance of both [East and West] and to regulate itself by the one as much as by the other"(26).

In some passages Thorndike tried to bring the divergence between Rome and Canterbury to its barest minimum. He then found that two articles of the Creed held the key to reconciliation: "one holy Catholic Church", and "one baptism for the remission of sins". "All the controversies between the Reformation and the Church of Rome would be determined if we could agree about the due sense of these two points, about the due consequences of these two articles"(27). Should these points be investigated, Rome as well as England would realize that the public penance of the primitive Church must be re-introduced. It would then take action against the superstitions of some of its members. It would also reach an agreement with England on the true authority of the Bishop of Rome, which is patriarchal, but not papal. It would also concede that the present Church lies under the judgment of the Church of all times, which alone is infallible.



(This brings us to the heart of Thorndike's conception of Catholicity. His devastating criticism of Puritans is that they reject the Church as a society. They claim to be saved first, and then to covenant themselves into a Church. The Catholic pattern requires the reverse: the Church is primary. It has not been established by a Covenant among believers. It derives from the Apostles as one visible society,) "one society, one visible body, communion, or corporation of men from the beginning, the communion whereof always confined the profession and conversation of Christians to some certain visible rule"(28). It is "a visible society or corporation of all Christian people subsisting, or that ought to subsist, by a charter from God, one and the same from the first to the second coming of Christ"(29).

(The charter of continuity, unity, doctrine and law is the God-given episcopal structure of the Church.) Episcopacy perpetuates the Apostles' authority(30). Catholic unity resides in the continued authority of the Apostles. The present holders of

apostolic authority are the Apostles' successors, the bishops. Catholicity at any time consists therefore of the mutual relationships and the unanimity of the bishops. Spiritual power "having been canonically exercised by a hierarchy of Bishops according to the extent of their Sees—the greatest and first being that of Rome—during the time of six General Councils, the same measure of canonical power in governing the whole Church is propagated and ought to be maintained in the Bishops of the respective Sees, the authority whereof is visibly propagated from the Apostles"(31). When bishops are in total agreement, the visible unity of the Church is obvious. When they disagree, the Church as a society is in a state of self-schism. This is the case between Rome and Constantinople(32), and between Rome and England(33). "I infer that there may be a schism in the Church upon such terms that salvation may be had upon both sides. . . . And such I would have that schism to be which the Reformation has occasioned"(34). This eliminates from the one Church all the Churches and sects that have lost episcopal succession. There remain Rome, the East and England, all united, in spite of their mutual schism, within the visible body of the Catholic Church: "The succession of the rulers of any Church from the Apostles is enough to evidence the unity of the Catholic Church as a visible corporation consisting of all Churches"(35).

The Catholicity of doctrine is not overlooked. Thorndike knows as well as anybody that "the same visible Church cannot be the same visible Church but by the same visible (laws)"(36). He fully accepts the consequence: as long as we do not restore "the whole faith and laws of the primitive Catholic Church"(37), episcopacy is not enough. Much more is needed: "The profession of faith, the rule of government, the rites of God's service, are the things that must make a Church a part or no part of the whole Church"(38). Only the apostolic hierarchy of bishops can protect or, if need be, recover, these necessary ingredients of Catholicity. Thorndike dislikes Roman Catholic polemicists who speak always of the Papacy, taking everything else for granted once the Papal Supremacy is accepted. He wants to discuss each point of faith and practice one after the other, each standing on its own

merits(39). Yet he knows that in the long run "the visible unity of the Church must stand or fall with episcopacy"(40). It is visible in the form of "a standing synod" of bishops(41).

Put in a nutshell, Catholicity is the unanimity of the Church's faith as expressed by the apostolic authority of the episcopal hierarchy. (Full Catholicity exists when bishops formulate the faith of primitive times. In other words, three elements constitute Catholicity: first and second, "the tradition of faith and the authority of the Scriptures which contain it"; third, "the succession of pastors from the Apostles"(42). Or, in a remarkably pregnant sequence:

The faith *upon* which, the powers constituted by the Apostles *in* which, the form of government *by* which, the service of God *for* which (the Church) subsists: if these be not maintained according to the Scriptures interpreted by the original and Catholic tradition of the Church, it is in vain to allege the personal succession of pastors—though that be one ingredient in the government of it, without which neither could the faith be preserved nor the service of God maintained, though with it they might possibly fail of being preserved and maintained—for a mark of the Church(43).

Thorndike trusts that this standard proves the Church of England to be the Catholic Church in England. But it is not enough to believe it. One must still strive for complete visible unanimity of the Catholic Church today as it was unanimous in the past. Compared with the doctrine of most Caroline divines, this unchurches non-episcopal bodies more definitely than most dare to do. Yet Thorndike's stand is far from negative: it derives from his high conception of episcopacy as a structural element of the Catholic Church-pattern.

(Thorndike's warning to his Anglican colleagues was given in deadly earnestness: "There is no true mean, no just way to reconcile any difference in the Church, but upon those grounds and those terms which I propose. . . . Whereas, not proceeding upon those grounds, not standing on those terms, all pretence of reconciling even the Reformed among themselves will prove but a mere pretence"(44).)

These lines were written before the Restoration. Thorndike had time, in the years before he died in 1672, to see that many, in his beloved Church of England, did not share his concern for Catholicity. He was brought to castigate "Bishops that shall betray their office and hold [Presbyterian] usurped ordinations for good, and give [Presbyterians] authority to exercise the Orders which they never received"(45). Such bishops are "schismatics, making themselves accessory to the usurpation of schismatics, and profaning the imposition of hands, which they received their Orders with, to authorize the same"(45).

(Meanwhile, for most in the Establishment, the lure of comprehension proved more attractive than primitive Catholicity. Had he lived twenty years longer, Herbert Thorndike would have seen the Church of England torn asunder because not all Anglicans disapproved of secular interference with the apostolic authority of the episcopate.)



In the years of the Restoration Thorndike's decided Catholicism was somewhat isolated. Most of those who were instrumental in rebuilding the Established Episcopal Church did not share his dim view of the English Reformation and were not prepared to be as radical as he was in imitating primitive Catholicity. They were satisfied, in the main, with the Restoration Settlement and its Laudian pattern. So could George Bull (1634-1710), Bishop of St David's in 1705, complain about the evils of "this remote age", "this degenerate age"(46), yet serenely identify the doctrine of the Church of England with that of the Catholic Church. Bull appealed to "the Catholic Church of the first three centuries" which was, for him, representative of "the universal Church of Christ of all ages"(47). Modern Christians must, like their remote forerunners, "cleave to that doctrine and faith which was preached with one mouth, as it were, by the Bishops and presbyters in the Apostolic Churches throughout the world, in agreement with the Holy Scriptures"(48). This is constitutive of Catholicity and is the standard of Catholic faith. The English Reformation, as Bull understood it, has not betrayed this sacred trust.

Thorndike's full teaching, however, was not lost. His view of Catholicity was not deprived of champions when theories were put to the test at the end of the century. The figure that dominates this later period is undoubtedly that of Henry Dodwell (1641-1711), who began his theological career when Thorndike ended his. A layman, although he had studied for the priesthood, Dodwell was a prominent patrologist. His acquaintance with the Fathers made him stress and investigate more thoroughly than others the patristic roots of Anglican principles. Although his interpretations were at times peculiar, he was on the whole a competent and faithful follower of patristic Christianity.)

Until the turning-point of 1688, when a Protestant monarch did away with the High-Church episcopate, Dodwell took his distances from both Dissenters and Recusants in the classical fashion of Caroline divines. He refuted the latter's notion "of a Catholic Church virtual and their adhesion to the Pope as a principle of Catholic unity"(49). He pronounced it uncatholic to "abridge the power of ordinary Bishops and ascribe all to the omnipotency of the Roman See"(50). He denied the existence of "any infallible judge of controversies", and argued that, "we may be Christians, nay and Catholics too, that is, we may believe as many articles as at first were imposed as necessary to be believed, without the least obligation of being Romanists, that is, of believing all their superinduced novel doctrines"(51). Catholicity, thus far, is identified with the faith of the first centuries. On this ground Dodwell agreed with Rome on the matter of tradition: "Not only the Church of Rome, but our Mother the Church of England has required that no other expositions of Scriptures be urged publicly but such as are agreeable to the doctrine of the Fathers"(52). Both Churches teach on this point the doctrine of the early Catholic Church. Dodwell registered a similar concurrence concerning Church government: "In that our Church has innovated nothing that should cause any breach even from the Roman, much less from any other part of the Catholic Church"(53).

Dodwell's line of argument against Presbyterians corresponds to his agreement with the Roman Catholic Church. He cannot

admit their principle of Scripture alone(54). He objects to their disregard of the episcopal structure of the Catholic communion: "No authority can be expected in this present age, but in that communion where the succession of apostolical power has been continued to this present"(55). In his *Discourse concerning the One Altar and One Priesthood* (1683), written against the Presbyterian leader Richard Baxter, Dodwell justified episcopacy from its sacramental or, as he said, "mystical" meaning. The structure of the Church in the New Covenant follows that of the Church under the Old Covenant. As the High Priest mystically represented the *Logos*, so does the Bishop mystically represent Christ.

In keeping with this spiritual understanding of the episcopal function, Dodwell subordinates everything in the Church to the sacramental order: "By confining the ordinary communications of His grace to the sacraments, [God] has put it in the power of them who have the power of the sacraments to exclude from these ordinary conveyances of grace." The sacraments are "visible confederations of this body politic" of the Church(56). Unity is no other than communion in the same sacraments. As sacraments are, ultimately, in the hands of bishops with apostolic authority, there is no unity outside the episcopal communion. Wherever he resides, a Catholic must join the communion of the local bishop, "as he would secure the ordinary means of his own particular salvation"(57). As Dodwell concludes, the Catholic Recusants are unreasonable, for they prefer the Bishop of Rome to their English bishops. But recusancy has been made possible by the fact that there are two methods of judging a Church to be Catholic.

The Roman method proceeds "by being first assured that that particular Church shall never fail of being Catholic itself, and that all other particular Churches must approve of their Catholicism by their conformity to that which can never be otherwise"(58). This implies the notion of a "virtual" Church. Dodwell objects that, were it valid, such a notion would "have been originally delivered by the unanimous consent of the Catholic Church diffusive"(59). No such assent may be found among the Fathers.

Dodwell relies therefore on the second method of testing Catholicity, that of the Anglican Church: "We cannot be assured that a particular Church must necessarily be Catholic antecedently to the trial of its Catholicism by a recourse to the primitive records"(60). Catholicity is not established by what the Church teaches today, but by what she taught in early centuries. One must have "immediate recourse to the originals"(61), namely, to the Scriptures and the Fathers. This corresponds to Thorndike's desire to check each point of faith rather than define first which is the Catholic Church and take her teaching for granted.

An objection can be made that correct doctrine does not guarantee the validity of episcopal succession. Yet the Catholic Church, as Dodwell has insisted, is not only known by the correspondence of her doctrine with that of early times. She is known also by episcopal succession.

In Dodwell's mind, validity of succession is itself a doctrinal matter. As a historical phenomenon, it is visible. Yet we are made certain of its validity by reference to the doctrine of the Church as a whole: "The validity of succession depends on the practice and sense of the generality of all places and ages, but especially of all ages." The consecrator's intention is of course to be considered, for "a particular person might intend differently from the rest of his brethren". But this does not always invalidate the succession which he transmits: "He could give no more than himself has received, and what that was depended on the intention of the ordainer, which again will be best presumed from the sense of the generality"(62). Unanimity of doctrine defines Catholicity; it also guarantees apostolic succession in spite of the exceptional vagaries of individuals.

The Catholic Church is thus one in doctrine and one in episcopacy. "Communion with a particular Church is nowhere understood as a profession of union with her alone, but also with all such whom she accounts orthodox members of the Catholic Church"(63). By submitting to one bishop a person is under the episcopal college as a whole. This is Catholicity today: "The whole Church is governed by the episcopal College"(64).

All this is fairly consistent with the trends of Caroline theology and especially with the Catholic emphasis of Thorndike. Dodwell, however, goes further than others in his analysis of the sacramental function of bishops. Bishops are not mere administrators. They are mystagogues. Their role is mystical. It is not by a happy historical accident that the Church of England has conserved episcopacy, but because episcopacy belongs to the essential charismatic structure: bishops hold the key to the sacraments, which are the ordinary channels of grace.



From Dodwell's standpoint, no intrusion of secular government into the spiritual responsibility of bishops is tolerable. No power on earth may force the hand of those whom Christ has entrusted with the keys of the Kingdom. The action of King William in suspending five English bishops in 1688 struck Dodwell as a momentous sacrilege, a challenge to the Catholic structure of the Church of England. Dodwell therefore loudly denounced the "schism" of the usurpers whom the King placed in the sees involved, and the "schism" of those who communicated with them. As the schism lasted, he spoke of the Church in the past tense: "our late common Mother, the Church of England" (65). Eventually, Dodwell attempted to bring the schism to an end. He advised the deposed bishops not to perpetuate their line of succession. At their demise the usurpers would, by general consent, become legitimate. Eventually the schism ended as Dodwell thought it should. The Non-Jurors, deprived of bishops, returned to the Establishment. In Dodwell's theology, however, it was the Establishment that returned to Catholic unity. But this took more time than Dodwell expected. As far as he was concerned, the schism ended in 1710. But not all agreed with him. The last Non-Juror consecration which is historically well documented took place as late as 1795, one full century after the break (66).

A major objection to Dodwell was provided by the history of the English Reformation: had not Cranmer taught that bishops were made and unmade by the King? Had not Elizabeth deposed the Roman bishops at the beginning of her reign?)

(Indeed, Dodwell is well aware that Cranmer was not Catholic in any sense. Thorndike had found fault with Henry VIII and the means adopted to reform the Church in England. With Dodwell it is no longer dissatisfaction, but a frenzied denunciation of "that sacrilegious reign"(67), of "this extravagant notion of the Supremacy"(68). No Roman Catholic has ever been harder on Cranmer than Dodwell was: "It is but a poor recommendation of him as a friend of our Church, that he made a conscience of maintaining opinions by which she might be ruined, and her enemies obliged in conscience to ruin her"(69). Did Cranmer reform the Church? Far from it; he "reduced her to a just mediocrity"(70). How could that deserve the name of Reformation, "which perfectly destroys the government of the Church and thereby dissolves the society which was the thing to be reformed"(71)? Cranmer, as our first chapter showed, enslaved episcopacy under the King's will; episcopal jurisdiction was "but by, under and from the Prince"(72). The result, says Dodwell, was to be expected: "These are the plain consequences from the principles by which Archbishop Cranmer acted. If they freed the Church from the tyranny then in being, they naturally introduced a tyranny of more pernicious consequence than that which had been ejected by them"(73).

Hard as he is on Henry VIII, Edward VI and Cranmer, Dodwell is partial to Elizabeth: she did not share the conception of episcopacy which prevailed under Edward. Thanks to her, and especially to the Thirty-seventh Article, we are "clearly and expressly discharged from all obligation to believe Archbishop Cranmer's singular opinion"(74). When her deposition of bishops was discussed, Dodwell was nonetheless in a quandary: he had to explain it away. This highhanded manner of treating bishops had been a sore point with Thorndike. Dodwell, however, by a strange mental legerdemain, justified it with a number of hypothetical arguments that were hardly consistent with some of his principles.

In the first place, Popish bishops were "of another communion"(75). How this squares with Dodwell's claim that episcopal succession continued through the English Reformation escapes

the eye. Thorndike was more consistent when he founded the English Reformation on the assumption that Rome was and is a true Catholic Church. Be that as it may, Dodwell brings other suggestions: the deposed Popish bishops had probably been consecrated by letters patent from Edward VI: in this case, they could be deprived by the Crown of what the Crown had given them. A third hypothesis admits that their deposition was not valid. But the deposed bishops refrained from consecrating successors to themselves: when they died, the legitimate succession passed on to the Elizabethan appointees(76). This was the pattern advocated by Dodwell to end the Non-Juror schism.

Dodwell did not only review the supposed antecedents of the situation created by William's deposition of the bishops. He made a major theological effort to deepen his conception of episcopacy and of Catholicity. Whatever the accidents of the Reformation may have been, it was on theological ground that episcopacy had to be upheld and the schism of the intruders condemned.



The word "Catholic" in Dodwell's mouth has very definite connotations. Before being a historical term that may be applied to visible institutions, it has a transcendental meaning. In today's terminology, we would call it sacramental. Dodwell usually refers to it as "mystical". In the early Church the word started its career with a "mystical" meaning. As time passed, the historical implications of that meaning were explored.

Ignatius of Antioch uses the word "Catholic" in a purely mystical sense. This is at least how Dodwell reads his letters. The Church which he entitles Catholic is "the invisible and archetypal Church under Christ, the archetypal and invisible Bishop" (77). The Catholic Church of Ignatius is the triumphant Church in heaven. Why, Dodwell enquires, does he call it Catholic? Simply because Ignatius uses Platonic categories and idioms. In Platonism the archetypal ideas of which earthly realities are shadows are "Catholic", that is, universal, models. The Church in heaven is the model of all earthly Churches. It is their universal

"idea", the pattern which they imitate. In this sense Ignatius of Antioch calls it "the Catholic Church": "This was the primary signification of the Catholic Church"(78).

In a second application, the term applies to particular earthly Churches. We are still in Christian Platonism. Terrestrial realities receive their form from archetypal ideas. Similarly, "local Churches receive from that archetypal and heavenly Catholic Church the reason of their being called also Catholic"(79). When heresies arose, orthodox Churches were known by the name Catholic, for they alone were in communion with the heavenly archetypal Catholic Church. In such a communion of a Church on earth and the Church in heaven, both have one point in common, their communion with the Apostles. "This apostolic Church in heaven is the archetype to which all earthly Churches must be referred"(80). Churches are Catholic only by way of their communion with the Apostles, that is, "if they have kept inviolate the doctrine of the Apostles"(81). On account of this, "vice versa, what had been apostolic received the name of Catholic"(82).

The realm of doctrine now provides scope for a third implication of the Catholic idea. Catholicity rests on the doctrinal consensus of the Churches founded by the Apostles. In them the communion with the Apostles may best be seen. This consensus was explored especially by Hegesippus, when heresies that arose under Emperor Hadrian made it urgent to devise a simple way of ascertaining the apostolicity of faith(83).

A fourth meaning derives from this: Catholicity designates the agreement of orthodox Churches today to hold communion one with the other. This is "the modern and commonly received notion of Catholic, as it includes all particular Churches in the world which maintain commerce with each other by the same common rules of communion"(84).

The mystical meaning of Catholicity does not refer us to the Apostles only. Rather, doctrinal communion with them is the means of our communion with the "archetypal bishop", Christ. Between the Church of this earth and the triumphant Church there is so close a relationship that participation in one entitles

to participation in the other. The Church as a society is patterned on the society of the Holy Trinity. The doctrine of the Trinity has not "been revealed for speculation only, but purposely to oblige men to unite in it as a society. The Unity in Trinity . . . was purposely (revealed) to let men see the extent of the mystical union to which they were entitled by the external union with the visible Church. It was therefore supposed that by partaking of the Trinity we are made one mystically, and that by being united visibly to the Church we are entitled to that mystical union" (85). The Catholic communion on earth is an absolute prerequisite for communion with the Blessed Trinity in heaven. On this ground Dodwell deviated from the common sacramental theology: he agreed with St Cyprian that sacraments conferred outside of the Catholic communion cannot be valid. Consecrations performed in schism are null and void: this was the main weapon in his fight for the Non-Juror bishops.



The mystical notion of Catholicity has been embodied on earth in the Church structure. The bishop of each see mystically represents the archetypal Bishop. In the very first days of the Church, however, things were not exactly as they are now. Only the Bishop of the Church in Jerusalem directly symbolized Christ. The right to admit "immediately into the archetypal and heavenly communion" was "then peculiar to the particular Church of Jerusalem, so that no other Church on earth had any right of admitting to communion with the Jerusalem from above, which is the Mother of us all, than as she had a right of admitting members into the communion of the earthly ectypal Jerusalem". The reason for this singular privilege is that the Apostles were still living and Jerusalem was their headquarters: "Our Saviour and his Apostles were the archetypal evangelical Church" (86).

At the death of the Apostles this privilege passed over to all episcopal sees. Bishops succeed the Apostles in this communion with the archetypal Bishop, the head of the heavenly Jerusalem, Jesus Christ. "All other Churches are, by the last act of the Apostles, made equal with the Church of Jerusalem. . . . Every

particular Church has the same right with that of Jerusalem of having its acts ratified in the true Mother Church of the heavenly Jerusalem"(87). What holds true of each Church applies also to each bishop. "Each particular bishop, as supreme within his own jurisdiction, has the same right of obliging the mystical Bishop immediately in relation to the subjects of his own jurisdiction..."(88).

It follows that schism plunges into the depths of sin. Separation from the local bishop implies a divorce "from Christ and his Church triumphant in heaven"(89). Dodwell sees this as the situation of the schismatic Church of England, which has cut its ties with the lawful bishops; it is the case of the Roman Recusants, who look to the Bishop of Rome rather than to those of England; it is finally the case of the Protestants who have abandoned episcopacy.

Dodwell does not judge the conscience of schismatics. We "have no authority to judge them and... are likely to have enough to answer for ourselves"(90). But to suspend sentence on a man does not condone his deeds. The dire consequences of schism do not permit complacency. "All hopes of pardon of sin, of the Holy Ghost, of eternal life, or performance of duty", are shipwrecked(91). No Christian sacraments exist outside of the orthodox communion, which itself cannot be other than episcopal. She alone conveys "a right to its communicants to all the merits of Christ and the heavenly benefits of mystical communion". All "communions divided from her" are "for that reason presumed to be divided from the heavenly communion and therefore divided from God and Christ". Dodwell's argumentation against "occasional communion" is based on this. Many Presbyterians made it a point to receive communion in an Anglican parish from time to time; and many Anglicans thought it was a happy arrangement that preserved a link between Dissenters and the Established Church. This infuriated Dodwell's orthodoxy. For Presbyterians are schismatic from episcopal authority. "One single act of sacramental communion with any divided bodies from the one orthodox communion" is "alone sufficient to divide the communicant from that privileged body, which could alone

entitle to the benefits of the celestial communion"(92). "They cannot be one with the Episcopal, who own no obligation in conscience to episcopacy, which is the uniting principle of the Church as a society and a communion"(93).

There arises from this theology an amazing perspective on the principle of Catholic unity.

The Church is related to the Trinity through Christ, the invisible, archetypal, Bishop of the Church in heaven. On earth, the same relationship is channelled through the bishop of each Church. Belief in the episcopal function is therefore a fundamental of fundamentals. It underlies and makes possible everything else. No bishop, no Church, for there is then no sacrament, no tradition and no faith.

If there be degrees of fundamentals, I should think the fundamentals concerning the Church as a society to be of the greatest consequence, and therefore fundamental in the highest degree. . . . So that in order to the keeping these other fundamentals, the Church as a society is supposed antecedently as a condition that alone can qualify her for having such a trust committed to her. . . . He that denies the Church as a society invested with a spiritual authority does as effectively contribute to the ruin of all the other fundamentals at once, as he does to the ruin of a house who subverts the foundations of it. It brings in impunity for heresy in general, and suffers heretics still to hope as well in their separate sects, as if they were in the orthodox communion(94).

The cornerstone of the Church as a society is the bishop. As successor to the Apostles he has inherited their authority to bind and to loose. Their powers, however, go back to God Himself. Using a forceful language, Dodwell describes the bishops as "the visible authorized representative of the Father and the Son"(95), "Christ's visible substitutes"(96), "the principle of unity"(97). Being united to the bishop, we enjoy "the benefit of ordinary communion", which "makes us one body with the Apostles themselves and the ancient Patriarchs and indeed with the whole Church triumphant, and entitles us to our share in all that is enjoyed by any of them"(98). This Catholic communion provides the only way of knowing who belongs to the number of

the elect: "None are elect who are not of the visible Church, either in deed or in desire"(99). The elect of the New Testament are her members, even though they remain liable to fall. They alone walk in the Light; outside the episcopal communion reigns "a state of Darkness", "the contrary communion of the Devil"(100).

Rejection of episcopal authority renders a man "alien to the communion of Christ"(101). Dodwell strongly warns against "occasional communicants": these "are not true to the terms of communion, which would . . . have obliged them to forbear all other opposite communions"(102). It would be a sad mistake to fancy that such practices can win converts: "I am sure we have no great reason to forbode well from our past experience . . ."(103). A simple, inescapable truth must be proclaimed: non-episcopal Christians are foes of Catholicity, of episcopacy, of the rule of tradition deriving from Christ. "The fewer enemies the better. And still the better for the public if they be out of the body"(104). Were Anglicans lukewarm about the mystical function of bishops, a horrible thing might come to pass: near-Presbyterians could be inducted as bishops. Saddled with bishops who are not truly episcopalian at heart, where would the poor Church of England head for? "Bishops of their mind may make what changes they please, whenever they can overvote their episcopal brethren. And that in the name, and by the authority, of the Church of England itself. They may suffer our episcopal succession to fail with their persons, if they may only be permitted to enjoy the episcopal revenues for their own lives"(105).

Dodwell evidently entertained a low opinion, that need not be shared, of the moral integrity of Low-Churchmen. Their hypothetical greed apart, however, his words have a prophetic ring. The process by which Laudian theology was expelled from episcopal sees started in his time. Soon Benjamin Hoadley (1676-1761), a Bishop of Bangor who during the six years of his incumbency never once resided in his diocese, would teach that Christ has delegated authority to nobody and left no visible Church behind him(106). When this theological bomb exploded

in the twilight of the lingering Laudian vision, the Bishop of Bangor encountered spirited resistance. But the courageous Lower House of Convocation was victimized by the Crown for its indignant reaction to Hoadley's preaching: prorogued in 1717, it was never again summoned for business until 1852. Another voice of High-Churchmanship was thus effectively silenced. Meanwhile, the seeds of Low-Churchmanship would bear their fruits. It is no longer possible today to labour under the delusion that Anglican bishops in general hold a Catholic notion of Church order. Our age has heard dignitaries of the Anglican communion publicly disbelieving most of the major tenets of the Christian faith. Thank God, this has remained exceptional. Yet disregard of the meaning and purpose of episcopacy by bishops has become a recurrent and widespread blight in the Anglican communion of Churches. Dodwell's arguments against the "occasional communion" of his day hit the "partial inter-communion" of today just as well. . . .



The loss of prestige and influence which the Non-Juror schism brought on Catholic-minded Anglicans was compensated by the theological deepening of which Dodwell's doctrine presents a striking example. Catholicity is no longer, as it was under Elizabeth, a desire in search of a formula. The formula that has been adopted is that of the patristic era: the gathering of the Church around its bishop unites it to the heavenly "bishop and guide of our souls".

Catholicity is not a horizontal union of the Reformed Churches. It is a transversal communion through time of all the episcopal Churches, joined together by their common root in the heavenly Church, the Jerusalem from on high. Catholicity is thus a visible mark of the Church because it is an invisible union to the heavenly Church. Its visible token is the bishop himself at the local level, and episcopacy at the universal. Invisibly, it relates to the divine society of the Three Persons.

Apart from Catholicity there is no Church. Claims of faith, of direct salvation by Christ, of passing a Covenant among

believers are broken, as on a rock, on the fact that the Church of the first ages knew only one communion, and this episcopal. This was the *Catholica* of the Fathers, belief in which they imposed on all successive generations by inserting it in the Creed. There is no salvation outside of this visible and mystical unity of the holy Catholic Church.

Where it has failed to preserve this Catholic pattern, the English Reformation must be brought to perfection. This cannot be done by aping the Continental Reformers and their epigones, the English Dissenters. Such a course would doom the Church. One must rather return to the Fathers and make the Church of England as fully orthodox and Catholic as the Church was before internal schisms separated East and West.

(Like the Caroline divines earlier in the century, Thorndike and Dodwell willingly accept to be called Protestants: they protest what they consider to have been Roman accretions. In particular, they protest the inequality of bishops as implied in the Roman system of government. They remain anti-Roman in proportion as Rome, as they believe, has forgone Catholic elements. But this does not turn them into Protestants in the sense of Scotland or Geneva. "I confess that I cannot be of the 'Protestant subjects' of this Kingdom if [the Independents] be." This is Thorndike's protest against Protestantism(107). Speaking of those who claim salvation before receiving membership in God's episcopal Church, he adds: "If they may pass for Protestants, I must also be a Catholic Protestant, and protest to abhor their profession as damnable"(108).)

These outspoken protests may sound negative to Protestants. But mere Protestantism sounds negative to Catholics. Thorndike's Catholic protest is only the negation of a negation. It inescapably follows from the belief in the episcopal structure of the holy Catholic Church, outside of which there is no salvation.

Chapter Five

THE NON-JURORS

Glory be to Thee, O Lord my God, who hast made me a member of the particular Church of England, whose faith and government are holy, catholic and apostolic, and free from the extremes of irreverence or superstition; and which I firmly believe to be a sound part of Thy Church Universal; and which teaches me charity to those who dissent from me; and therefore all love, all glory be to Thee.—Thomas Ken.

THE Anglican eighteenth century started under a bad omen. Through many ups and downs of painful internal divisions, the Non-Juring schism lingered far into the century. It stayed on when the King's tyrannical gesture which had provoked it had become little more than a memory. The theological distance between the Non-Juring Church and the Established Church grew as the latter nibbled the former to vanishing point. The Established Church indeed, contrary to what is commonly believed, had some remarkable thinkers. The names of Archbishop Wake, of Daniel Waterland, of Bishop Butler and of some of the Evangelical leaders rank deservedly high in Anglican theology, and could compare with the great names of any Continental Church at the time. Yet the spirit in which they work is no longer that of the Laudian period or of the Restoration. The Church of England no longer presents the spectacle of a Catholic party on the march, patterning the Establishment on the model of the first centuries, developing a Catholic framework of liturgical life, and returning to theological conceptions which the Reformation had more or less overlooked or deliberately discarded.

The Protestant wing now is on the march. Freed from the Puritan threat to dis-episcopalize the Church, the bishops can

afford to be generous toward Protestantism, even at the risk—which weighs lightly on the shoulders of most of them—of jeopardizing part of their Catholic heritage. They find support in this with the Whig government at home, for whom High-Church trends more or less equate Jacobite policies. Abroad they sense their kinship with foreign Protestants, Lutherans and Calvinists alike, largely through their common opposition to the Counter-Reformation, which is now victorious on several fronts. The doctrine of the Anglican bishops swings now to the left along the range of Anglican thinking, toward Latitudinarian positions. But while Archbishop Wake, for one, entertains far and wide correspondence with Calvinists, Lutherans and even Gallican Catholics in whom he sees possible reformers of the Church of France, the situation in village parishes at home is steadily deteriorating. The eighteenth century marked the low ebb in Anglican spiritual life. It would be rash to venture a judgment on this spiritual dearth, if contemporaries had not bitterly complained about it. And though many of these testimonies derive from hostile witnesses, Non-Jurors or Methodists, their purport cannot be seriously questioned. The lukewarmness of the clergy at large can only explain the Evangelical reaction in the second half of the century. And only the fact that too many lay people hungered after a Gospel which they too seldom heard can explain the amazing spread of the Methodist movement.

(It was, however, by a small margin that Protestantism won the battle at the beginning of the century. Not all the Catholicizing tendencies of the seventeenth century had petered out, even though they undoubtedly were on the wane and had lost much of their influence. Contacts existed between Anglicans and Orthodox; but the dream of being the Orthodox Church in England, which kept the Non-Jurors' hopes alive for a few years, was no mere vagary. It was tied up with a general concern that pervaded the best minds in all the shades of Anglican theology.) The attraction of what Archbishop Wake called "the promotion of a Catholic communion" was powerfully felt. (The trouble was that some looked to Protestantism for Catholicity, whereas others, for a time at least, expected salvation from the East.)

There were even a few who dreamt of achieving Catholicity through reunion with Rome.

★

Thus it was that the century opened with a call for union with the old Church of Rome. This would deserve to be called extremely courageous, had the book in question been signed by its author. As we know it, the *Essay toward a proposal for a Catholic Communion* (1704) is an anonymous pamphlet. It was rather easy to dismiss it on this account as a foolhardy diversion. Nathaniel Spinckes, the Non-Juror, did so in refuting it, on the alleged ground that it had been written by a Roman Catholic posing as an Anglican(1).

This was hardly fair. Whoever wrote it conveys the impression of truly being an Anglican, loyal to the tradition that he has received from the Caroline divines, critical of the English Reformation as many Restoration theologians had been, apparently unscathed by Non-Juring tendencies, eager only to perfect the Catholicity of his Church by union with the Catholic Church of Rome. Examining a number of alleged differences between the faith of Rome and Anglican formularies, he showed that the divergence was not such as most people assumed: it would be easy for Anglicans to accept the explanations of moderate Roman Catholics, and to subscribe to the doctrines thus explained. The attraction of this unknown author toward Rome arose from the simple reason that no Catholic communion could be achieved without unity among the bishops of the Catholic world. He wished to restore the visible Catholicity of former times:

But while I speak of Catholic communion . . . I intend . . . only such as was formerly in the primitive Church, when all Bishops of the earth were known by their communicatory letters; when they saluted one another by the name of brethren and colleagues; when each Bishop maintained the rights of his own Church and expressed a zeal for, and was concerned with, the good of the whole; when charity cemented divided nations into one body, and of all believers made one kingdom, one mystical body of Christ. Such a Catholic communion is what I propose(2).

This irenicism failed to obtain a hearing. Even the outstanding liturgist Edward Stephens, who professed heartily to embrace "the dignity of the Church of Rome and the authority of the Bishop of Rome as chief Patriarch in the Kingdom of Christ", refuting the *Essay*, denounced "the scandalous usurpations of Rome" in the name of "the duty I owe to the truly Catholic Church"(3). Stephens at least reached the core of the problem, the nature of the "truly Catholic Church", and his solutions were far from conventional in the Anglicanism of his time: "The Greek Communion I take to be the only true Catholic communion in the world and therefore preferable before any other"(4). How this is compatible with "the authority of the Bishop of Rome as the chief Patriarch in the Kingdom of Christ" is a question which Stephens uncomfortably left hanging in the air. In his liturgical works, he constantly appealed to "the usage of the Holy Catholic Church". And the liturgies which he devised show this usage to be that of the Fathers. From this we may surmise that, in his mind, the truly Catholic Church is that whose doctrines and liturgies come closest to those of the Fathers. His identification of this with the Greek Church did not blind him to the patristic antecedents of the authority of the Bishop of Rome.

The most thorough attempt to refute the *Essay*, however, came from the Catholic ranks of the Non-Jurors. These could well fear that more woes would pile up on their current troubles if public opinion associated them with a Romanizing view of Catholicity. No sooner was the *Essay* published than Nathaniel Spincke undertook the task of putting things straight. One cannot help feeling, however, that his point by point refutation of the *Essay* misses the central matter of Catholicity. Truly, the small and dwindling Non-Juring community could hardly think of Catholicity in terms of universality. If they were concerned for purity of Catholic doctrine, they were less willing to hear a call to "Catholic peace". The final appeal of our anonymous author thus remained unheeded: "I... conclude with this wish, that our present generation, both divines and others, would have some regard to the deliberate judgment of the learned, who have given

such encouragement to the present essay, and to the method of a Catholic peace"(5).

Peace, Catholic or not, was not the lot of the Church of England in those years. High- and Low-Churchmen were fighting for control of Convocation. Having lost the bench of bishops to Low-Churchmen, High-Churchmen attempted to keep the Lower House in their hands. As Queen Anne was favourably disposed toward them, some High-Churchmen gained bishoprics. The most ardent spokesman for High-Church principles, Francis Atterbury (1662-1732), became Bishop of Rochester in 1713. But this could not upset the Whig political landslide. This in turn doomed the prospect of a High-Church hierarchy, which, in the mind of the Whigs, would favour the Tories. The main battle-ground was therefore the Lower House of Convocation. The Convocation controversy, in which High-Churchmen tried to protect the traditional rights of the Lower House, saw historical learning soar on both sides, as Atterbury and Wake, among others, marshalled history in their respective attempts to boost or to dim the authority of the Lower House. The battle in Convocation ended on 17th May 1717, through the Government's intervention. Convocation was suspended for its opposition to the Protestant ideas of the Bishop of Bangor. It never met again to transact business until 1852.

This was another high-handed interference in Church affairs. That Benjamin Hoadley did not believe in the authority of bishops was a matter for his own conscience. That he was made a bishop in 1715, although he openly denied the notion of the Church as a society, would perhaps have been difficult to reconcile with a delicate conscience. At any rate, it was a challenge that High-Churchmen could not ignore. They went down in Convocation defending the "nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ", which Hoadley had, in a book against the Non-Jurors in 1716(6) and in a sermon before King George I on 31st March 1717, explained away.

Before High-Churchmen were officially vanquished, however, they had occasion to fire a powerful, if ill-advised, round in favour of Catholicity. This started with a fiery sermon delivered

in St Paul's Cathedral on 5th November 1709. Sermons for Guy Fawkes's Day were commonly devoted to attacks on Popery. But Henry Sacheverell knew that the plotters, if plotters there were, were not hiding in Rome. They were at home, lying in ambush within the Establishment, manœuvring to undermine its Catholic doctrine and its unity. Sacheverell, accordingly, denounced, in a somewhat intemperate language, "this pious design, of making our house a den of thieves, of reforming our Church into chaos, [which] is well known to have been attempted several times in this kingdom, and lately within our memory"(7). The Church of England must brace itself and be united again. There must be no more "knavish distinctions of High and Low Churchmen"(8). The one way to restore inner unity is to expel the enemy.

And indeed it would be both for our advantage as well as their credit, if such men would throw off the mask, entirely quit our Church of which they are not true members, and not fraudulently eat the bread and lay wait for her ruin, purloin her revenues and ungratefully lift up their heels against her. For then we should be one fold under one shepherd, all those invidious distinctions, that now distract and confront us, lost, and we should be terrible like an army of banners to our enemies, who could never break in upon such uniform and well-compacted body. This indeed would be true peace and solid union, when we should all with one mind and one mouth glorify God, and not with a confused diversity of contradictory opinions and inconsistent jargon of worship, which the God of peace, purity and order cannot but abhor(9).

This challenge to Low-Churchmen started another controversy. This was embittered by the Government's decision to impeach Sacheverell. As things were, the intervention of the powers that be against a Catholic conception of the Church backfired. The lengthy trial of Sacheverell irked High-Churchmen to the extreme and made reconciliation with Low-Churchmen more remote than before. Sacheverell was found guilty of "rebellion" in March 1710. Yet the court manifested its disapproval of Whig Church policy by imposing on him only a token penalty: he was forbidden to preach for three years. Henry

Sacheverell had poured oil on fire, and one may question the wisdom of his timing and of his language. Yet he had done so with a true vision of Catholic unanimity in doctrine and worship within one episcopal society.

★

The Grand Old Man of the Non-Juring Church was Bishop George Hickes. Being Dean of Worcester at the beginning of the schism, he became "Suffragan Bishop of Thetford" in 1694, when Archbishop Sancroft decided, with the approval of the exiled King James II, to perpetuate the apostolic succession in the ranks of his faithful remnant of the old Church of England. In 1713 he in turn, assisted by two bishops from Scotland, consecrated others. He thus prolonged the Non-Juring separation from the Establishment, in spite of the return to it of men as influential as Henry Dodwell.

Hickes has been harshly judged by Anglicans for this obduracy. Yet one point should never be forgotten. Hickes always did his utmost to combat schism. Only, it was the Establishment which was, to his eyes, schismatic. Hickes was no fanatic. But his conception of "the evangelical theocracy, which is the Catholic Church"(10) made it impossible for him to steer any other course. Indeed he suffered when he reflected that "the whole Catholic Church in all places groaneth together, and waiteth for the time when she shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God"(11). He longed for a liberation whereby "she would indeed look like a theocracy or royal priesthood, like a new Sion indeed, like Jerusalem which came from above and is free, and not like the Jewish Jerusalem, which was in bondage with her children"(12). Alas, Hickes knew that, in the terms of another Non-Juror, Charles Leslie, "the Archetypal and truly Catholic Church in heaven is that which is chiefly and principally meant by the Holy Catholic Church and the communion of saints in the creed; and there only is perfect unity"(13). The Church on earth is a shadow of the heavenly communion and unity. She suffers from the breaches of charity that have pitted bishop against bishop. Yet there is one institution that no Christian may abandon

without unchurching himself: episcopacy. Without episcopacy the Non-Jurors would not be the Church, just as Continental Protestants, who have abolished episcopacy, are not the Church. The Church of Rome has protected it. She is therefore a true Church, though "purely in the metaphysical sense of the word, as true signifies real, and not in the moral sense" on account of her corruptions(14). Before the Revolution of 1688 the Church of England was a true Church in a metaphysical and a moral sense. Because of this "the Satanical sect of men", the Presbyterians, sought her ruin. She had "truly Catholic doctrine . . . divine authority . . . apostolical mission . . . spiritual discipline . . . priesthood . . . holy sacraments . . . primitive policy and government by bishops . . . independency of the powers of the world. . ."(15).

The true essence of Catholicity on earth resides in episcopacy. Jesus Christ, "the great Apostle and High Priest of our profession and Bishop of our souls . . . established his kingdom upon earth in the episcopal government and mission". Any other form of Church Order set up by men is only "another government, another mission and another ministry of their own divising, against the government and ministry set up by divine authority for the Catholic Church"(16). It is "no better than a band of rebels against the Catholic Apostolic Church, and altogether unworthy the name of a Church, as being not only an absolute variation from the Church of Christ as to its policy and mission, but a sworn confederacy against them, even the abomination of desolation in the house or kingdom of God"(17).

This forceful language makes sense in the one hypothesis that episcopacy is not only a matter of organization, but also a necessary element of our relation to God. Precisely, in Hickes's theology, episcopacy does not only link us to the Apostles. It also connects us with God, "who founded it in the person and office of his Son and appointed it for the government of his kingdom"(18). Each bishop is the principle of unity with Christ. This is the doctrine that Leslie expounded in a pamphlet addressed to Bossuet: "We do esteem every bishop with his college of presbyters and deacons and the laity of his district, to be a particular

Church, wherein the bishop presides as representing the Person of Christ, and to be the principle of unity in his Church, as St Ignatius speaks”(19). The “body of the Holy Catholic Church” (20) is thus made of all dioceses, these being “complete bodies under their several bishops”(21). Christ is the one head of the whole. And though many bishops are of equal authority, the entire body is one Church only: “all the parts of the whole Catholic Church, of which it is made one body, are parts of the same name and nature with one another and with the whole”(22). Or, looking at the Church from the other side, she is “one homogeneous body, consisting of parts of the same name and nature with one another and with the whole”(23). The Church is one on earth, though this is unity in plurality. And “as the Church is one, so it has one priesthood, one faith, one baptism . . . one communion”(23).

It was clear to Hickes that by condoning the violence done to some of her bishops by the State, the Church of England had fallen from her high estate as a true Church in the moral sense. She retained the name of bishops. Yet she altered their function, making them subservient to men instead of simply obeying Christ as known in the Catholic tradition. Hickes conceived that it was his duty to prepare her return to Catholic unity by perpetuating the genuine episcopate in a Non-Juring succession. Throughout his life he remained faithful to the true Church of England before the Revolution.

Hickes was ready to take abuse for his Catholic principles. He well knew that he and like-minded Churchmen were nicknamed “the highest flyers of the Church of England”(24). Men used a “party language”, calling them “high Church, high-flyers and enslavers of mankind”. These could be turned into terms of glory. “I am for the height as well as the breadth and length of the Church. . . . I am as much for the highest pinnacle of it as any other part. . . . I also profess to be a high-flyer, whose endeavour is to fly upon the wings of angels, to my Saviour, to the General Assembly, to the Church, the High Church, of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven”(25). Hickes was obviously devoid neither of wit nor of courage. His theology

implied a programme that he would follow point by point, trying to save the Church for true episcopacy when what he saw as the apostasy of most Anglicans threatened the very structure of the Church in England.



The original thesis of the Non-Jurors was that they continued the Church of England before the Revolution. They therefore looked to the past rather than the present Churches for examples and encouragements. The Church of Rome they particularly avoided. Nathaniel Spinckes, a Non-Juring priest who was consecrated a bishop in 1713 refuted the *Essay toward a proposal for a Catholic communion*. Hickes considered Rome to be a true Church in the metaphysical, not in the moral, sense. Bishop Thomas Brett, in 1718, assailed the "corrupt traditions of the Church of Rome, because we cannot find any evidence for their universality and antiquity" (26). Charles Leslie blamed Rome for having departed from the Catholic conception of episcopal authority: "We think the divine and apostolic authority of the episcopate swallowed up at Rome in the sovereignty of the pontificate" (27). The Non-Jurors never budged from this distrust of Roman Catholicism. Yet as time passed and the memory of their first years grew dimmer, it became increasingly difficult for them to maintain their claim to be the continuing Catholic Church of England before the Revolution. After George Hickes had died in 1715 and nobody could succeed him as the universally acknowledged leader of the small Non-Juring Church, a twofold movement took place among his followers. On the one hand, some of them tended to reach deeper into the past than the fatal date of 1688 in order to find their model. On the other, they also looked for fellowship towards the distant, and badly known, but ancient and undoubtedly Catholic, Eastern Churches.)

(The first issue badly divided the Non-Jurors and brought about a schism inside of their already small community. This is known as the Usages controversy. In a word, some Non-Juring bishops decided to do away with the liturgy of the Book of Common prayer as they had inherited it from the Restoration.)

They wanted to complete it with "usages" or practices that had been embodied in the Book of Common Prayer of 1549 and left out of the second Book of Common Prayer, as they believed, to placate Continental Protestants. These "usages" were the "mixed chalice", or mixing of water with wine, the commemoration of the faithful departed, the *epiclesis* to the Holy Spirit in the Canon of the Liturgy, and a prayer of oblation at the offertory. They were to be found in the Scottish Liturgy of 1637; and traditional evidence persuaded some Non-Jurors that, since they also belonged to the primitive liturgies of the Church, they could not be dispensed with without an infidelity to primitive Catholicity.)

The polemic started in 1716, a short time after Hickes's death. In 1717, the party of Bishop Jeremy Collier, who favoured the Usages, broke communion with Bishop Samuel Hawes. A new liturgy, enriched with the Usages, was printed in 1718. Only in 1732 was a reconciliation achieved between Thomas Brett, Collier's successor, and George Smith, who had inherited Hawes's authority. Even then a few diehards on either side refused peace and persisted in a growing isolation. The details of this extremely involved and needlessly bitter controversy need not detain us. Yet one point deserves notice. The Collier-Brett faction acquired a new consciousness of its Catholicity in its opposition to what they considered to be Protestant liturgical novelties. Hawes's section continued to be faithful to the Church of England before the Revolution. They did not move from the original position which had been that of George Hickes. Collier's followers, however, could no longer claim to be the Church of England before the Revolution: they had now discovered that already before the Revolution the Church of England was unfaithful to her Catholic patrimony. They had to delve further into the past in order to find their roots.

This entailed a painful evolution. Thomas Brett, who joined the Non-Jurors in 1715 and was raised to the episcopate the following year, testified that he underwent the agony of spiritual fire; but once on the road to true Catholicity he was compelled to follow it to the end. "My hearty affection to the Church of

England, the very great esteem and veneration I had for her, made me unwilling to believe it possible she could have so many defects. But when upon further consideration and, I trust, a more impartial examination of all her points, I found the light to be clear and the defection palpably discernible, I could not but see and acknowledge it"(28). In his days in the Establishment, Brett had defined the Catholic Church as a society extending to all nations, one in its head, in its Spirit, in its foundation, Jesus Christ, in its faith, in its sacraments, in its hope, in its love and in its government by the Apostles' successors(29). Later, however, he saw that only the primitive Catholic Church fulfilled all the terms of this definition. His loyalty could no longer go to the Establishment, although he still felt that the Church of England came "nearest to this communion of any Church in this part of the world at least"(30). He now considered himself a member of the primitive Church. "If therefore I am asked of what communion I am of, I must answer that I am of the communion of the primitive Church, of that Church which our Saviour and his Apostles first planted at Jerusalem, from whence it gradually overspread the whole world, and from thence obtained the name of the one, Catholic and apostolic Church"(31). His purpose as a member of the Non-Juring communion was to bring this communion and next, if at all possible, the Establishment, nearer to the primitive Church of Christ, by restoring "these doctrines and practices of the truly Orthodox and Catholic Church for the first four or five hundred years after Christ"(32). In Thomas Brett's mind, this was not breaking with the present Church, not even with the present Church of England: the Injunctions of 1571 ordered priests of the Church of England to preach only the Old and the New Testament, and the doctrines "which the Catholic Fathers and ancient bishops have collected from that very doctrine"(33). The Establishment soon departed from this rule. Yet the rule remains binding. For fidelity's sake one must reform the Church of England in a Catholic sense.)

Brett's view of the partial apostasy of the Church of England is thus joined to a persisting belief in her basic Catholicity. The achievements of the Church of England have lagged behind

her intentions. Brett throws the blame for this on "the foreign Reformers, both Lutherans and Calvinists"(34). He is especially harsh on Calvin: "Calvin, who could not bear that any Reformation should be carried on without him", sent emissaries to England "to draw Cranmer and the civil power to his side and, under pretence of making a better Reformation, to spoil what was already well done, and put a stop to any further progress toward primitive Christianity"(35). The fundamental difference between Catholics and Protestants concerns the function of tradition as the interpreter of Holy Scripture. The Protestant Reformers "were for making the Scriptures the only rule of their Reformation, but not as interpreted by the tradition of the ancient Church, but according to that sense which best pleased themselves"(36). The Catholic view, on the contrary, joins Scripture and the primitive tradition inseparably. "It is necessary for the right understanding of our duty as Christians that we join together Scripture and tradition; and as we cannot receive any tradition which is contrary to Scripture, so neither can we receive any interpretation of Scripture which is contrary to truly primitive and universal tradition"(37). This was called by Brett "the sum of the matter"(38).

At this point, the section of the Non-Juring Church which has restored the Usages as in the first Book of Common Prayer has renounced and denounced the Protestant aspects of the Reformation. Only the currents which, in the English Reformation, brought the Church back to primitive Catholicity may be retained. Anything else constitutes an unlawful accretion, and therefore an infidelity to the Catholic tradition. It should be pruned before the Church can be fully restored to Catholicity.

★

(It is understandable that on the basis of this growing concern for Catholicity and this increasing distrust of Protestantism, the Non-Jurors should have tried to establish relations with the Orthodox Churches. It is equally logical that opponents of the Usages should have quickly dropped out of the epistolary exchanges with the East. Their adversaries, on the contrary,

continued to search for remnants of Catholicity in the contemporary world.

These exchanges were occasioned by the visit to England of an Orthodox dignitary in 1716. Letters travelled back and forth, sometimes at long intervals, between 1716 and 1724. Yet the Non-Jurors were in a difficult position to talk to the Orthodox. Their knowledge of Orthodox Church life was sparse. The Orthodox themselves were entirely in the dark as to the identity of those distant English Churchmen who introduced themselves as being the Orthodox Church in England. This mutual ignorance created unavoidable misunderstandings. From the start, for instance, the Non-Jurors attributed a primacy of honour in the whole Church to the Patriarch of Jerusalem(39). They were guided in this by their theoretical view of the primitive organization of the Church. The Orthodox Patriarchs rightly answered, on 18th April 1718, that the traditional order of the Eastern Patriarchates was in the reverse: Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and, last, Jerusalem. This order had grown out of the experience of the living Church and formed now part of the tradition(40). In 1722 the Orthodox still felt the need for another statement to the same effect.

Lack of communications thus foiled the tentative approaches from England and hindered the dialogue that was in the making. Thomas Brett and his friends assured their correspondents that they had restored the ancient Catholic liturgy of England, to which the Orthodox rejoined that no such liturgy was known in the East, and that, if there was indeed one, it should be held in suspicion on account of the heresies and schisms of "those regions"(41). There is no cause for surprise in the fact that the Orthodox prelates wondered that their English friends styled themselves "the Catholic remnant of the British Churches", "the Catholic bishops of the British Churches"(42). These high-sounding titles were indicative of increasingly Catholic claims. The Non-Jurors were following the dream of a Catholic primitive Church truly restored, with fraternal relations between all its bishops. Given their more and more precarious position and their steadily dwindling membership, it was only a dream.)

Yet it was a beautiful dream. Prospects of implementing it came to an end in 1725. William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, was then acquainted with the correspondence. He hastened to assure the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos, that far from being the Catholic bishops in England, his English correspondents were rebels against the Church, schismatics and, in a word, impostors(43).

★

The climax of the upward curve of the Non-Jurors' theology was reached in the works of Thomas Deacon. By any Catholic canonical standard, Thomas Deacon was in a highly irregular situation. He was ordained by Jeremy Collier when he was only seventeen years old. In 1733 he was consecrated, by one bishop instead of the traditional three. Archibald Campbell was responsible for this. It was a high-handed way of treating the sacrament of Orders. Yet this confidence in Thomas Deacon's courage and integrity was well placed. Eventually, the disciple outdid the master. For after Brett's reconciliation with the Non-Usagers in 1732, Deacon went on his way pursuing a lone fight for what seemed to him primitive Catholicity. A weekday doctor and a Sunday bishop, he ministered to a tiny congregation in Manchester. This was all that remained, in his eyes, of the Catholic Church in England. He gave it a remarkable liturgy, by far the most Catholic product of Anglican liturgical fertility. His last years were darkened by the Jacobite rebellion of 1745. At the end of this hopeless revolt his eldest son died of illness in gaol; his second son was executed for treason; and his third son, no more than a child, was savagely transplanted for life. But as he died in 1753, he could have made his the last statement of his second son before being executed in July 1746:

I profess I die a member, not of the Church of Rome, nor yet of England, but of a pure Episcopal Church which has reformed all the errors, corruptions and defects that have been introduced into the modern Churches of Christendom: a Church which is in perfect communion with the ancient and universal Church of Christ by adhering uniformly to antiquity, universality and consent: that glorious principle which, if once strictly and impartially pursued, would, and which alone can, remove all the distractions and unite

all the divided branches of the Christian Church. This truly Catholic principle is agreed by all Churches, Eastern and Western, Popish and Protestant, and yet unhappily is practised by none, but the Church in whose holy communion I have the happiness to die(44).

Thomas Deacon's theology took shape in the fire of the Usages controversy. Like all Non-Jurors, Deacon was searching for primitivity in the framework of universality. With Thomas Brett, his true Father-in-God, he convinced himself of the Catholicity of the Usages which the second Book of Common Prayer had abandoned. What did he mean by Catholicity?

In 1718 Deacon assailed the Roman Catholic understanding of purgatory and took occasion of this to define Catholicity. The Church of Rome, he believed, is "a large unorthodox schismatical branch of the universal Church, this term being taken in the most extensive sense"(45). She is not Catholic in any of the two senses of the word. Catholic "must mean either universal, or pure and sound"(46). Whereas the Church of Rome is neither, the Non-Juring Church is Catholic in the latter sense. She is indeed a small, particular Church. Yet "a particular Church may be said to be Catholic. . . . A particular Catholic Church is a rightful bishop with his clergy and laity united to them, professing the true Christian faith without the addition of false doctrine, and practising the necessary Christian worship without corruption"(47). Such a particular Church is in communion with the primitive Church. On this ground Thomas Deacon claimed antiquity for the Non-Jurors. Addressing Roman Catholics, he boldly challenged them: "I insist upon it that our Church is many hundred years older than yours, even as old as the Apostles, the faith, worship and polity of our Church being the same with that of the primitive Catholic Church of the four first centuries"(48). As to the members of the English Establishment and the Non-Usagers, they may be lumped together. They have forgone Catholicity. They have departed "from primitive tradition and deviated from the constant practice of the universal Church for the first fifteen hundred years"(49).

With the Non-Jurors in general, Deacon thus maintained what he believed to be the primitive communion, at the cost of

being increasingly isolated from the other Christians of his time. He was now detached from the Anglican Church as it stood in 1688. In 1721 he could sum up this process of detachment in telling words: "When I came to consult history, the less defensible I found the Church of England"(50). By 1729 he equally anathematized Rome and Canterbury and cast envious glances towards Constantinople, despite the breakdown of the correspondence with the East:

I can no more subscribe to the Articles and Canons of the Church of England than of the Council of Trent. And though neither the Greek nor the English Church be perfectly pure, yet I cannot help thinking the former to be the more eligible communion. I am afraid there are almost as many popish points (by which I mean corruptions of the Western Church and deviations from the primitive) unreformed in the Church of England as she has reformed, so that, according to her present constitution, she seems to me to be a mixture of Popery and Calvinism(51).

Deacon was so convinced that the Usages formed a touchstone of Catholic worship that he could not back down when Thomas Brett, in 1732, agreed to a compromise with the more conciliatory Non-Usagers. In spite of this, Deacon was consecrated by Brett in 1733. For a while he was not quite alone. Bishops Archibald Campbell and Roger Lawrence had refused the compromise, while Bishop John Blackburne had rejected it from the Non-Usagers' side. The Non-Juring Church was more confused and divided than ever. Yet Thomas Deacon held on, defending to the end the Catholicity of his small flock, a lone Catholic island amid the apostasy of the Western Churches.

The last compendium of Deacon's theology was published in 1747 in the form of a shorter and a longer catechism(52). To Deacon's everlasting credit, the hard straits to which both his Church and his family were then reduced by no means stilted his theology. He still had a grandiose conception of the Church:

The Church is Catholic, that is, universal, because it extends to all times and places: it is the same Church that has continued from Adam, Noah, Abraham and the other Patriarchs down to Moses; from Moses, the high-priests, who were descended from his brother

Aaron, continued till Jesus Christ; and from Jesus Christ we have an uninterrupted chain of Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, down to this time. The Church extends to all the countries of the world, and everywhere professes the same faith and uses the same sacraments(53).

In the Longer Catechism, Deacon identified this Catholic Church with the sum total of "all particular faithful Churches, of each of which the bishop is the visible head"(54). Membership in a "particular faithful Church" is "the only means of communicating with the Holy Catholic Church". And "it is only by communicating with the Holy Catholic Church that we can be united" to our Lord Jesus Christ(55). Deacon leaves his reader's conscience to itself facing the claims of rival Churches. His own choice has been made and maintained in the teeth of excruciating adversity.



While Thomas Deacon's evolution as a Non-Juror brought him to a unique claim to constitute, with his few followers, the whole Catholic and Orthodox Church in England, another Non-Juror, William Law (1686-1761) travelled a long distance in an altogether different direction. William was a deacon in the Established Church. In 1715 he resigned his fellowship at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, because he declined to take the anti-Jacobite oath at the advent of King George I. In 1729 he became a Non-Juring priest. Yet his association with Non-Juring congregations always remained loose. He progressively adopted a theological position that was a far cry from Non-Juring, or, for that matter, from any sort of Catholic orthodoxy.

William Law acquired immediate fame for his spirited rejoinder to the ecclesiological doctrine of Bishop Hoadley. His *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor* (1717-19) have deservedly remained a classic of charitable controversy and a gem of English prose. His positions then were far from the extreme that could be expected from a Non-Juror. He appealed to his readers, regretting the "strange way of reasoning that some people are fallen into, who seem to know nothing of moderation, but jump as constantly out of one extreme into another, as if there was no such thing as

a middle way or any such virtue as moderation"(56). As applied to the notion of episcopacy, which Hoadley denied, moderation does not give too much importance to the fact that episcopacy is not clearly taught in Scripture. It acknowledges that episcopacy is nonetheless "founded in Scripture itself and asserted by the universal voice of tradition in the first and succeeding ages of the Church"(57). On this ground the innovations of the Bishop of Bangor can be by-passed as fantastic. One may safely believe in "an old-fashioned visible Church, as Churches went in the Apostles' days"(58). As surely as Christ came in person to the Jews, he now comes "to Christians in his Institution . . . and it is as dangerous to disregard him in one appearance as it is in the other"(59). Like the general tone of the *Three Letters*, this provides a good sample of middle-of-the-road Anglican theology.

Law, however, little by little interiorized and idealized his conception of the Church. Through his reading of the works of the German mystic Jacob Boehme, he came to give more and more importance to interior unity with the Spirit of Christ, and less and less to the externals of religion. Among these he finally placed the ecclesiastical divisions of Christians. His *Letters to a Lady inclined to enter the Church of Rome*, which were written in 1731 and 1732, only two years after Law's ordination, still maintained the necessity of a rational enquiry into the true Christian Church. Yet the stress no longer lay on the institutions that correspond to Christ's design and that are in conformity with the early tradition. Law was mainly interested in another point: there are "great differences in Churches considered as a means of arriving at Christian holiness"(60). From this standpoint, he concluded: "Some of them are so merely human and of man's contrivance as to make it necessary to come out of them"(61). This was not the case between the Church of England and that of Rome. Both share equal means of holiness.

Rome and England differ only in that they are in a state of mutual schism. "What is it that has made the schism, but the unreasonable quarrels and unjust claims of the governors on both sides? Can I undo what they have done by my changing sides?"(62). In other words, members of the two Churches are

not responsible for the schism that separates them. The blame attaches to the leaders who broke communion with one another, and with those who wilfully maintain this uncharitable situation. Ordinary laity and clergy may remain within either Church without consenting to their separation and to the faults of their leaders. Speaking for himself, Law asserted: "I stay in the Church of England because Providence has placed me in its communion, and because it has the terms of salvation; I wish everything that is schismatical in it was removed by those who have a power to remove it"(63). Joining the Church of Rome would entail a public gesture of schism from the Church of England, which he in conscience cannot agree to make. As for Roman Catholics, their situation is similar: "They may be free from all schismatical or unjust proceedings of their governors, as the private members of any Church may be"(64). To stay where we are, then, is the only non-schismatic behaviour. "These seem to be the only principles of piety and religion for serious Christians to found their peace upon, in this divided state of the Church, where the division is wholly owing to the unreasonable claims and uncharitable proceedings of the governors on both sides, and where both retain all that is of the essence of religion"(65). William Law accordingly recommended to his correspondent "to love the Church of Rome or Greece with the same affection and with the same sense of Christian fellowship as you love the Church of England, and to consider yourself, not as an external member of one in order to renounce communion with the other, but as necessarily forced into one externally divided part, because there is no part free from external division"(66).

William Law was thus tempted to oversimplify matters. He overlooked doctrinal differences and the relevance, for good or for bad, of the events of the Reformation. His interest in the Church became more spiritual than institutional. Contradicting his former insistence on the Institution, he even reached a point where he undermined the institutional elements of Catholicity in order to emphasize the mystical. For Law did not rest satisfied with the irenic view of Rome which he had outlined to his lady-correspondent. He had anticipated the theology of many

an Anglo-Catholic of later times when he had defined the difference between Rome, Greece and England as one of mutual schism. His advice to stay where we are without endorsing schismatic acts as being the only way to avoid the sin of disunion, could be signed by more recent authors. Yet Law's motivation was not that of modern Anglo-Catholicism. Anglo-Catholicism today is based on an identity of doctrine between England and Rome, or rather on the fact that Anglo-Catholics *may* hold in the Church of England the doctrines that *must* be held in Rome. Law's position is based on the assumption that whatever doctrinal differences are to be found between the two Churches are irrelevant to the holiness of their members. Catholic doctrines, with him, are not the hall-mark of Catholicity; it is on the possibility of holiness that a Church must be judged. This is bound to entail a doctrinal minimism.

Such a minimism was only implicit in the *Letters* of 1731. It was made explicit in the last years of Law's life. His posthumous *Address to the Clergy* (1761) stated it concisely: "Popery is nothing, and Protestantism is nothing as to salvation, but a sinner changed into a saint"(67). He distinguished between external and internal Church unity. The requirement for internal Church unity is for any man "only and solely his conformity to and union with the inward Spirit and outward form of Christ's life and behaviour in this world"(68). This alone "concerns the conscience"(69). As to external Church unity, it is "merely human"(70): "Every Church distinction is more or less in the corrupt state of every selfish, carnal, self-willed, worldly-minded, partial man"(71).

Law has become quite indifferent to the Catholic tradition. This is patent when he writes that it would make no difference if "the Church in my baptism should sprinkle a little milk or wine instead of water upon my face"(72). True baptism is an "inward disposition of repentance, of faith in Christ, to be born again in him"(73). This obviously destroys Law's conclusion that "under this light" he is "neither Protestant nor Catholic according to the common acceptation of the words"(74). For this is precisely a Protestant conclusion. William Law wants no more

"vain wanderings", "fruitless searchings into a Council of Trent, a Synod of Dort, an Augsburg Confession, an Assembly's Catechism or a Thirty-nine Articles"(75). To the "reigning fashionable orthodoxy" he now opposes "the true spiritual mystery of the Gospel"(76). He finally undermines all Catholicity, as understood by Roman Catholics, by Orthodox, by the Non-Jurors and by the Anglican divines of the seventeenth century: "The private man . . . is not to consider how outward things should be, according to the primitive plan, but how the inward truth, which is meant by them, may be fully adhered to"(77). This denies all recourse to tradition and all concern for the form, either of the sacraments or of the Church itself.

Thus William Law allowed himself to slip towards a notion of Catholicity that is not recognizable, except by Protestants of a very uninstitutional turn of mind. One may wonder if this was only due to Law's familiarity with Boehme's writings. After all, William Law as a Non-Juror sat between two stools. No longer at home in the Established Church, he never fully identified himself with the Non-Juring Church. His lack of roots in a Church institution may have partly detached him from Catholicity as a mark of the visible Church.



The importance given the Non-Jurors in this chapter could be misleading. The Non-Jurors were always a small group. By the half-century, they were no more than a handful. In the eyes of the Establishment, they were schismatics from the Church and rebels to authority. The deepening of their doctrinal convictions makes them invaluable for the historian of the Catholic idea in Anglicanism. For it suggests that a development along the lines of their theology could have been possible, and maybe still is possible, for the Anglican communion as a whole. Admittedly, this focus on High-Church theology should not make us forget that most Anglicans did not share the high principles of the Non-Jurors, or that, after Queen Anne, thanks to pressure from the Whig government and to a Protestant-minded bench of bishops, the key posts of the Anglican Church were in the hands of Low-Churchmen.

The greatest figure of the time among the bishops, William Wake, never hid his Protestant convictions. He was indeed anxious to favour "the promotion of a Catholic communion as far as it is possible among all the true Churches of Christ"(78). Yet this Catholic communion would be composed of all Churches professing their belief in the three Creeds, which "sufficed to define the Catholic faith in the first five centuries of the Church" (79). On this common denominator all could agree, if only they added to it "piety and charity"(80). The keystone of High-Church theology, episcopacy by divine right, found no place in Wake's view of a Catholic communion. On the contrary, he hoped to bring the French theologians with whom he corresponded to an acknowledgment of non-episcopal Churches as true Churches of Christ. As he candidly explained it to a Genevese friend, the first step would unite Gallicans "to and with the Episcopal Church here". Then one would go further: "Could we bring them so far and break them off from the Court of Rome, and make them an independent Church, we should soon see them insensibly go on to all we could further desire of them"(81). It is true that Wake disapproved of Hoadley's remarkable opinions on the nature of the Church. Hoadley did away with episcopacy, although he agreed to be made a bishop. An unmediated subjection to Christ alone was for him "the only true account of the Church of Christ or the Kingdom of Christ in the mouth of a Christian"(82). Wake was indignant. He wondered that "a bishop of the Church of England should write against his own authority, and yet not only continue to exercise it, but to seek by these very means to become more considerable in the very Church whose foundations he is so zealous to root up."(83) Yet this anger was aroused by the apparent duplicity of the Bishop of Bangor much more than by his doctrine. Wake did not himself believe episcopacy to be essential to the Church. He assured his Calvinist friend Turretini that the Thirty-sixth Article "only asserts the validity of our Book of Ordination, but does not affirm the necessity of the three Orders which we retain in our Church"(84). As a historian, Wake was right: the Articles do not teach the necessity of episcopacy any more

than their chief author, Thomas Cranmer, did. As a theologian, he sided with the Protestants against the Catholic tradition which had grown, in the Church of England, since the middle of Elizabeth's reign.

The Protestantism of Wake was compatible with a high opinion of the Church of England. He would have agreed with Samuel Johnson (1696-1772), founder of King's College in New York, that the Church of England appears "on many accounts the most pure and primitive Church at this day upon the face of the earth"(85). Yet neither Wake nor outstanding theologians like Daniel Waterland (1683-1740) were particularly concerned about the Catholicity of the Church of England. Its Protestantism loomed larger in their preoccupations. They continued on this point the tradition of Thomas Cranmer. The Church of England was one of the Churches that share "the ground and basis upon which the Protestant name stands"(86). This ground and basis was the denial of the Church's infallibility: Christians must be satisfied with "a proper certainty in matters of faith" or a "moral evidence"(87) ascertained by human reason.

An exception must be made in the case of Thomas Wilson (1663-1755), Bishop of Sodor and Man from 1697 to his death—a length of tenure which was quite unusual for an English bishop. Wilson is known for his piety and personal saintliness and for the somewhat strong hand with which he administered his diocese. The basic principle of his thoughts and actions was simply that the diocese over which he presided was identically the Catholic Church in the Isle of Man, out of which there would be no salvation for Manxmen.

Wilson understood the Church to "be composed of all people called by the Spirit to the belief and practice of divine truth". It is "one, Catholic and apostolic", having "its succession from the apostles, both in doctrine, and discipline and orders"(88). "What is meant by the Catholic Church?" Wilson asked in his *Hints for catechising out of Bishop Pearson on the Apostles' Creed*. "It is the universal Church of Christ spread over the whole world; designed for all people who will receive and obey the laws of Christ"(89). Bishops have "the authority of binding and

loosing”(90). When they proceed according to the rules given by Christ their sentence is “confirmed in heaven”(91).

Catholicity implies both universality and a divine form of government: the Church “is called Catholic, that is, universal, because it is by Christ designed for the salvation of all nations and people that will receive and obey the laws of the Gospel. And it is to the governors and pastors of this Church that Jesus Christ has made this remarkable promise: Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world”(92). Outside of this Church there is no salvation(93). Indeed Christ’s assurance that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail, which is only “meant of the Catholic or Universal Church”(94), does not guarantee perpetuity to each section or part of the Church. The Church of Rome is, according to Wilson, in a bad state. “A mystery indeed, that she that would be the mother of all Christian Churches should be found to be *the mother of harlots*, i.e. of such as commit idolatry; that Rome Christian should be so full of idols as to deserve the name of the Great Babylon; that she that calls herself the Holy Catholic Church should be all abomination”(95). Wilson found this, as he thought, in the Apocalypse. He also believed that “in all the articles of Popery added to the Apostles’ Creed, we shall find either money or the authority and power of their Church to be chiefly in view”(96).

Wilson was so conscious of his divine authority as a Catholic bishop that he made an unusual and rather ineffective gesture in 1743. A “Popish” priest, who had celebrated a marriage at Douglas, was excommunicated *in absentia* by Wilson, “until by his submission and acknowledgement of his offence and the scandal given to this part of the Holy Catholic Church, he shall make satisfaction”(97).

Thomas Wilson remained isolated in his High-Churchmanship, except during the short reign of Queen Anne, who favoured Toryism in State and in Church. His continuous residence in his see, while it set a rarely imitated example to his fellow bishops, made his influence almost nil outside of his diocese. In the main, the bench of bishops shared the Low-Church convictions of Archbishop Wake. The most advanced High-Church party, cut

off by schism from the main body of the English Church, was fast falling apart. Within the Establishment, the High-Churchmen were all but reduced to silence and passive resistance.



The picture was of course very different in Scotland. Non-Jurors were schismatic only south of the Border, since the Scottish Episcopal Church as a whole was Non-Juring. Small, persecuted and making strenuous efforts for survival, it was hardly in a position to produce theological work. Yet its relations with the English Non-Jurors in the first half of the eighteenth century confirmed the High-Churchmanship which Presbyterian persecution naturally fostered by way of reaction.

The doctrine of George Hickes on the nature of the Church entered Scottish theology through the works of Bishop Thomas Rattray (1684-1742). In *An Essay on the Nature of the Church* (1728) Rattray defined the Catholic Church as "nothing else but an aggregate of all the particular Churches" (98). Each bishop is at the head of a Catholic, that is, orthodox diocesan, Church (99). He is absolutely independent (100), the "visible and sensible ectype" (101) of the "archetypal principle of unity" (102), which is "the Father as the supreme" and "the Son as the subordinate head" (103).

This insistence on approaching Catholicity from the local or diocesan standpoint arises from the nature of the New Covenant, by which all cities are admitted to the privilege of Jerusalem, to have its one high priest and high altar (104). Through the local Church we are united to the "one high priest and altar in heaven" (105). "All particular Churches on earth are so many colonies of this celestial and archetypal Church" (106). In a mystical sense, then, "the one Catholic Church" is in heaven (107). Yet one must also speak of the Catholic Church on earth. Rattray described it fully:

The Catholic Church is a homogeneous body, consisting of similar parts, viz. these particular Churches with their particular bishops, united and confederated together by the terms, as of the one faith, which they are all bound to maintain as a sacred depositum or trust

committed to them; so of the one communion, which consists (as I have now shown) in their mutual obligation to admit each other's communicants, to reject each other's excommunicates, and to ratify each other's deeds, as being the deeds of Christ himself, the invisible bishop, transacted by his proper local representative, in his name and by his authority(108).

★

If Low-Churchmanship was waxing in the official English Church, it was waning in Scotland and it had totally disappeared from the English Non-Juring body. When the English Non-Jurors would themselves vanish, their Scottish brethren would remain to carry their flame through the arid years of the second half of the eighteenth century.

Chapter Six

EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY HIGH-CHURCHMEN

It is well known what strange work there has been in the world under the name or pretense of Reformation; how often it has turned out to be, in reality, Deformation; or at best a tinkering sort of business, where, while one hole has been mended, two have been made.—George Horne.

IN 1745 John Kirby (1705–54), a Non-Juring clergyman, tutor to the Gibbon family at Putney, published a little book entitled, *The capacity and extent of human understanding exemplified in the extraordinary case of Automathes, a young nobleman who was accidentally left in his infancy upon a desolate island, and continued nineteen years in that solitary state, separate from all human society.* The most extraordinary case of Automathes would have no title to appear in this chapter, but for one reason: the supposed reporter of his case, a Roman Catholic Benedictine, himself shipwrecked in Soteria, an unknown island off the China coast, discovered to his surprise that the inhabitants of Soteria were “such Christians as, according to his description, are not to be paralleled in any particular Church at this time in the known world, if a steady adherence to the apostolical doctrine and discipline in their original purity, and a strict conformity of practice and profession, may be allowed to be the glory of a Church”(1). The Soterians understood the Church to be “a distinct society of men” whom Jesus Christ has chosen “out of the rest of the world, to succeed Him in the same office at all times and in all places, wheresoever His Name should be known”(2).

There is something pathetic in this location of the best possible Church in an imaginary island. In 1745 the Non-Juring Church

was fast nearing extinction. The Roman Catholic Church, as depicted to the Soterians, inspired in them "the utmost horror and amazement", and they drew the conclusion that it was "in the most degenerate state"(3). Admittedly, the "manner of public worship" practised in this happy country, "had a very near resemblance to that of the pretendedly reformed Church of England, before the liturgy of that Church was changed for the worse in compliance with Peter Martyr, Bucer and the rest of their followers"(4). Outside of this point, there was little in common between the Church of England and the Church of Soteria, which had, when all is said, no parallel in the world. John Kirby had found the Church nowhere in a satisfactory state. He was reduced to dreaming of it.

Historians have, in the main, agreed with John Kirby that the second half of the eighteenth century was, for High-Church Anglicanism, a period of latency. It was the age of John Wesley (1703-91), who was of High-Church origin and maintained a largely High-Church theology together with his Evangelicalism(5). Yet as the initiator of a religious revival, Wesley failed notably to bequeath his own sense of churchmanship to his followers. The Methodists' defection from the Church of England after Wesley's death was the expected outcome of their straying out of the pathways of Anglican piety. While Methodism was thus in the making, the Evangelical Movement began to revitalize the English Establishment from the inside. As L. E. Elliott-Binns has shown(6), this was hastened, though not provoked, by Methodism. It has its sources in Anglicanism itself. Yet it did not start from, it did not claim, and it never developed a "high" conception of the Church. It was interested in piety rather than in theology; and the theological support it needed was commonly borrowed from the Calvinistic doctrine of Justification. Evangelical piety, faithful to the Prayer Book, nonetheless insisted on a felt experience of prayer which made it more germane to German pietism than to traditional Anglican devotion.

Yet the Caroline tradition of prayer was still alive. F. R. Bolton has given convincing evidence that it dominated the Church of Ireland well into our period(7). S. C. Carpenter has found it still

solid in England itself(8). The conventional picture of the beer-drinking vicar, who spends his time hunting with the squire, is largely false. It is true that our period did not see the Church of England at its best in matters liturgical. Yet on the other side of the Border the Scottish liturgy of 1765, influenced by the English Non-Jurors, was far ahead of the liturgy of the second Prayer Book(9).

In England itself the main controversies of the times hardly favoured the growth of High-Church theology. Efforts were directed against deism and unitarianism, though neither of these polemics inspired outstanding works. To a certain extent they may even have slowed down the development of High-Church thought: in the course of the polemics, "Catholic" came often to be equated with "Trinitarian". Thus the concept of Catholicity tended to be separated from a specific doctrine of the Church and to be identified simply with the carrying on of the traditional belief in the Trinity.

Meanwhile, most Church-of-England-men escaped both the struggling and politically discredited High-Church party, and the small, though enthusiastic and increasing, Evangelical party. The Latitudinarians, up to date in the ways of the world, following the scientific and philosophical movements of their age, broad-minded in religion and not too finicky about the minimal orthodoxy required of a Churchman, Whig in their political alliances, dominated the Church of England. Between the death of Queen Anne in 1714, who preferred Tories and High-Churchmen, and the accession of George III in 1760, they were undisputed candidates to the Episcopal Bench. After the latter date, Evangelicals and High-Churchmen began to have a chance again, George III feeling a hearty dislike for the Whig politicians, whom the first two Georges had supported. But by that time prominent High-Churchmen were few.

Yet in actual fact the state of Anglican High-Churchmanship between 1750 and the beginning of the Oxford Movement was better than most students of Anglicanism imagine. The older eighteenth-century studies of Abbey and Overton already devoted some space to the survival of High-Church theology.

The more recent volumes of Norman Sykes and of S. C. Carpenter have marked a turning-point in our knowledge and appreciation of the period. Although High-Churchmanship did not loom large in the overall picture, it was alive and active. No first-rate figure can claim attention. Neither by the volume of their output nor by its theological qualities can the High-Churchmen of the second half of the eighteenth century be entitled to first rank. Yet they are not negligible and their influence was better than nil. It was largely due to their transmission of High Church convictions that the Oxford Movement was possible. Some of the views that are considered characteristic of the nineteenth-century Tractarians were in fact oftentimes expressed by little-known authors of the eighteenth century. The theologians of this period were men of "between times". Mediating between the Non-Jurors and the Tractarians, they were overshadowed by both, yet they mediated effectively.



The Non-Jurors' secession from the Establishment impeded High-Church Anglicanism, since the most advanced developments took place outside of the official Church. Suspicion of High-Churchmen was rampant. Politically, they were suspected of favouring the Roman Catholic Stuart succession rather than the Protestant Hanoverian: the attempted coups of 1715 and 1745 effectively showed a number of Non-Jurors among the rebels. Even short of Stuart subversiveness, they were natural allies of the reactionary Tories against the progressive Whigs. Ecclesiastically, they were suspected of connivance with the Non-Juring schism. At the middle of the century, however, Jacobitism was vanishing as a political force. The Non-Jurors were dying out. Both on the political and on the religious fronts, the lines became clearer. High-Churchmanship could recover its traditional place in Anglicanism without too much interference from non-theological factors.

The question that faces the historian is: By whom was this recovery assured? The first answer that comes to mind would say, By the Non-Jurors who returned to the Establishment little by

little. But these Non-Jurors, or sons and grandsons of Non-Jurors, were unorganized, isolated and discouraged. They exercised lasting influence in their families and circles; but concerning the Church at large, they were not in a good position to use their talents, if they had any, for theological leadership. And, all things considered, they were not men or minds of great scope. They contributed to the survival and revival of High-Church ideas, yet they could not dominate the scene. High-Church Anglicanism followed a line of filiation of its own, outside of Non-Juring circles.

John Hutchinson (1674-1737) had a seminal influence, though by his dates he belongs to the first half of the century. His exegetical studies led him to curious, at times bizarre and fantastic, opinions. There was no clear connection between this and High-Churchmanship. But Hutchinson's concern for the spiritual senses of Scripture made him appreciate the Church Fathers and their understanding of Holy Scripture. By this bias, patristic theology could drive a wedge in English thought again. Several religious figures of the second half of the century accepted Hutchinson's principles of exegesis and were nicknamed "Hutchinsonians". All were decided High-Churchmen. Hutchinson himself was described by one of the so-called Hutchinsonians, in admiring yet dubious terms, as "a character *sui generis*, such as the common forms of education could never have produced"(10). This comes to say that Hutchinson was, in theology, a self-made man. William Jones, who left this pithy characterization, summed up "the principles of the Hutchinsonians" in twelve points. Some of these are extravagant: "Hebrew is the primitive and original language; . . . its structure shows it to be divine"(11). Some are distasteful: "Of Jews they think that they are the inveterate enemies of Christians"(12). Some are tinged with heterodoxy: "They entertain so low an opinion of human nature, under the consequences of the fall, that they derive everything in religion from revelation or tradition"(13). Others still are commonplace: they "give to God the pre-eminence in everything"(14). Two principles, however, reveal the heart of Hutchinsonian theology. Firstly, the universe is a symbolic universe: the Revelation is

partly couched in symbolic language; the Bible uses "types and figures" which "differ in nature from all the learning of the world; and so much of the wisdom of Revelation is contained in them that no Christian should neglect the knowledge of them"(15). Secondly, the natural creation is also symbolic: in both Testaments, divine things are "explained and confirmed to the understanding of men by allusions to the natural creation. . . . Such an analogy appears between the sensible and spiritual world as carries with it sensible evidence of the truth of Revelation"(16).

The "principles of the Hutchinsonians", as regards the symbolic meaning of creation and the symbolic vehicle of Revelation, could well have furnished the starting-point of a renewed ecclesiology. For the Hutchinsonians, the symbolic correspondence of the natural and the supernatural world is a key to all knowledge. As William Jones affirmed of the Blessed Trinity's analogy in the created world, "It opens a new and striking alliance between the theology of the Scripture, the constitution of nature and the mythological mysteries of heathenism. It connects and reconciles all learning and all religion"(17). The controversies of the times drew the attention to other problems than those of the Church and of Catholicity. Yet a few windows opened from which these fields could be glimpsed.

In the words of George Horne (1630-1792), Bishop of Norwich, and the most eminent of our group, Christ is "the substance of all legal shadows"(18). The correct theological method, accordingly, consists in "comparing Scripture to Scripture" and applying the Old Testament to the New, provided that "we have but humility to receive the key of knowledge from Christ"(19). Speaking of the Church, Horne finds "its original establishment, its form, its authority, its ministry, its unity and uniformity, its maintenance, its independence" described in the Old Testament(20). The New Testament adds nothing to this, "but the ancient constitution is referred to, to show us, in certain cases, what ought to be from what had been"(21). The Christian Church is symbolically described in the Old Testament. Noah's Ark has a meaning for us:

The sovereignty over the creatures originally vested in Adam, the father of the world, was put into the hands of Noah, the restorer

of it, and the halcyon days of Eden came over again in the Ark. Thus ought it to be in that other Ark, the Christian Church, built by the blessed Jesus for the salvation of all, whether Jews or Gentiles. The enmity subsisting between these was to be abolished and to cease forever, the moment they entered the holy doors of the sanctuary by the sacrament of baptism. . . . He who causes lions and oxen, wolves and lambs, to live quietly and lovingly in the Ark, He it is who makes men to be of one mind in an house; who makes the New Jerusalem to be a city at unity with itself(22).

Another type of the Church is the Tabernacle, which William Jones understands to be "a figurative term for the Christian Church as the mystical body of Christ". Jones pursues this analogy: because the Church, like the Tabernacle, is built on Mount Zion, every Christian is come "to a situation exalted above the world, a mountain chosen and favoured of God, blessed with the dew of heavenly grace and inheriting the promise of eternal life; even to that holy hill, on which Christ is established as king against all the opposition of the world below. It is the New Jerusalem, because it is ordained to be, as that city was of old, at unity with itself and a principle of unity to all the land"(23). Unity and unanimity are the main marks of the Church. These qualities imply continuity, for the Church is always "the same holy mount of God, the same heavenly city of God, to which the spiritual part of His people always belonged"(24). Being spiritual, she leads Christians by faith "through the shadows and figures of temporal things, to that other world where all things are real and eternal"(25). Yet she is also an institution, since "the living God must be the head of a living society"(26). Or, in the words of George Horne, Christians are held together "by the cementing bond of the Spirit"; they are united "to their head and to one another", as a result of which they "consider themselves as members of the same body, that is as a Church, as a fold of sheep, not as straggling individuals"(27). These two aspects, spiritual and social, are one. It is also as a society that the Church is not of this world. She "spends its year with Jesus Christ and follows him in faith through all the great work of his mediatorial office, from his Advent to the sending down of the Holy Ghost on the

day of Pentecost"(28). "When Christians go to heaven, they are not carried into a new society, for they are already, by the grace of God, translated into it by baptism"(29). The Church is this new society.

At this point the Catholicity of the Church enters the symbolic dialectic of the Hutchinsonians. Catholicity is another word for unanimity. "We are", Bishop Horne assures us, "members of the Church, which from the first has always gloried in the name of Christian, as expressing her unity with Christ, and in that of Catholic, as distinguishing her from all classes and clans of heretics"(30). It is necessary to belong to the unity of the Church "in order to obtain salvation"(31), just as it is necessary to profess "the Catholic faith which all nations were baptized into; and which except a man faithfully believes, he cannot be saved"(32). Horne explicitly calls the Trinitarian faith Catholic. Other beliefs also are part of the Catholic faith. Such is the belief in episcopal succession, since "a Church without a bishop was never heard of till the fifteenth century"(33). Samuel Horsley, successively Bishop of St David's, of Rochester and of St Asaph, (1733-1806), frequently appeals to the faith of the "early and uniform tradition"(34), to "the Catholic tradition"(35), to "the pure doctrine of the first age"(36), to "the accumulated authority of ages"(37). This faith is based on "the writings of the fathers of the three first centuries"(38). The "test of the truth" must be "the Scriptures and the Catholic traditions"(39). Such a faith logically assumes the "infallibility of the first preachers" of Christianity, which "opinion of their infallibility rests upon the belief of their divine illumination"(40). At the opposite, heretics "worship private authority while they fly in the face of universal. They deride an old and general tradition, because they have not sagacity to trace the connexion of its parts and to perceive the force of the entire evidence"(41).

The Catholicity of the faith goes hand in hand with apostolicity and purity. Samuel Horsley insists so much on this that he denies the possibility of progress in faith. He finds only "absurdity" in a "progressive religion"(42): "When Christianity was introduced into the world, it had no previous state of infancy and weakness

to go through before its nature and genius could be perfectly known; but appeared at once in full maturity and vigour”(43).

Catholicity also means universality in time and space. The Church, according to William Jones, extends “to all places and all times”(44), to all nations and conditions. In this sense, Catholicity denotes the difference between the Church of the Jews and that of the New Testament. “Why is the Church called catholic?” William Jones asks in *The Churchman's Catechism*. His answer joins together universality, stability and openness to the Gentiles:

Catholic means universal: and the Church is so called, because though it was spread over all nations, it was everywhere the same; and so, in the whole, one Church, one Body of Christ. It is also called catholic as distinguished from the Jewish Church, which was particular or peculiar, being confined to one nation or people; whereas the Christian Church takes in all the nations of the world(45).

The Church, which is the Body of Christ and the Ark of salvation, is not any particular Church. “The promise of perpetual stability”, Bishop Horsley teaches, “is to the Church catholic; it affords no security to any particular Church, if her faith or her works should not be found perfect before God”(46). The Universal Church has many “branches” which, by and large, follow national lines for, in the beginning, “the nations of the world were taken into one great *Catholic Church*”(47). Each “national Church” is a member of the Catholic Church of Christ. “There is no Church of Christ”, continues William Jones, “without the power of absolution”(48). That is, there is no Church without a bishop. Yet Bishop Horsley does not rule Calvinism out of the Church. Although he is very critical of Calvin(49), he esteems Calvinists to form “a respectable branch of the Christian Church”(50). The Church of Rome also is part of it: “I cannot admit that mere distance from the Church of Rome is the true standard of purity”(51).

As to the Church of England, these authors are occasionally despondent about her. “If we look at our own Church”, William Jones remarks, “we have but a melancholy prospect; and cannot help observing that it approaches too near to the

state of the Jewish Church before its destruction"(52). Bishop Horsley exploits the same theme: "The time may come, sooner than you think, when it shall be said, Where is now the Church of England?"(53). As explained by William Jones in *A Letter to the Church of England*, this wretched state stems from the name-calling that has taken place against those "who have dared to argue of late years as Christians did of old". Yet the men who "brand" these "with the name of High Churchmen" do better than they think: "For we know of no other true Churchmen; but faction, seeking rest for itself, finds none but by inventing names and distinctions which have no sense in the mouth of a Christian"(54). The Hutchinsonians are not a sect: "We do most sincerely disavow the name and the thing", Bishop Horne insists, "being fully persuaded of the necessity of being in the unity of the Church to obtain salvation. In the communion of the Church of England therefore we intend to die. . . . We disclaim the notion of any sect but that of the Nazarenes, and detest the idea of any party but the Church of England"(55). Yet disunity has in fact affected not only the English Church but all Christianity also. Bishop Horne complains that Christendom, "like Jerusalem before its destruction, is crumbled into innumerable parties biting and devouring one another"(56). In this sorry state of the Christian world and in spite of its own internal disunion, the Church of England remains "the brightest star in the Christian firmament"(57). William Stevens (1732-1807), a devout layman, cousin to Bishop Horne, expresses in these terms the unanimous opinions of his friends. The Church of England is, for Samuel Horsley, "beyond all comparison the soundest and purest of any in the Christian world"(58); she is "the first in consideration of all the Protestant Churches"(59). For William Jones, her doctrine "is, by profession, still pure and apostolical"(60). And for Stevens, "the terms of our communion are pure and scriptural"(61).

Yet the Church's purity is neither what it once was nor what it ought to be. In the trial of these days it is comforting to know of the early Catholicity: "There was a time, and it is pleasing to look back to it, when a Christian, furnished with proper credentials

from his bishop, might travel through the world from east to west and from north to south, and be received to communion with his brethren in any part of the globe then known"(62). George Horne looks also forward to a restoration of a similar unanimity, "when infidelity, heresy and schism shall come to an end, and there shall be no contention among the redeemed, but in giving glory and honour and thanks to Him that sitteth on the throne"(63). The solace of a Christian is to ascend "to a purer element, from where he beholds the storms produced by contending factions far beneath him. . . . He consoles himself in contemplating the Church as she formerly subsisted in original purity and unity, and as she will hereafter exist in her triumphant state above, when her members of every age and nation shall all lift up their voices together and make their sound to be heard as one"(64). Samuel Horsley also contemplates that eschatological reconciliation, "that glorious consummation, when faith shall be absorbed in knowledge and the fire of controversy for ever quenched . . . when the innumerable multitude of all nations, kindreds and people—why should I not add of all sects and parties—assembled around the throne, shall, like the first Christians, be of one soul and one mind"(65).

Does this flight into contemplation of the final restoration of all things imply a despair that Catholic unity can again be manifested in history? This could well be the case, for the prospects look bad indeed! Our authors do not venture positive statements on the matter. Bishop Horne prays for God's guidance on schismatics and heretics, "till the unhappy, misguided wanderers, having their eyes opened by the shining of his marvellous light, return to the Church, and all become one fold under one shepherd, even the Bishop of their souls, ruling in every Church that is his by an earthly representative"(66).



The defence of High-Church positions was not the concern of the Hutchinsonians only. Outside of their circles many Anglican clergy taught similar doctrines on the nature of the Church. One of the most popular catechisms was a Caroline

production, Bishop Pearson's Catechism, published for the first time in 1659 and constantly reprinted in the eighteenth century. High-Church convictions were at home, not indeed in most, yet in many vicarages and pulpits. The revival of piety was not only the work of the Evangelicals. In some instances it had a clearly "catholic" inspiration. An outstanding example had been set in the first part of the century by the life and works of the saintly Thomas Wilson, Bishop of Sodor and Man. The Isle of Man, as Wilson wanted it, would have been a model of primitive Christianity. Bishop Wilson's piety was High Church, and pietistic traits appear in his descriptions of the Church. His *Private Thoughts* contain the following note: "*The Church, or Kingdom of God*. A body of such people as profess the belief of the only true God, the creator and governor of the universe, the punisher of the wicked and rewarder of the good and of all that seek Him; and loving this one only true God with all their hearts and their neighbour as themselves . . . *An external Kingdom*"(67). Similar pietistic approaches to ecclesiology are frequent among eighteenth-century High-Churchmen. Philip Skelton (1707-87), rector of Fintona in Ireland, has most beautiful ones: "The real Church of Christ is a society bound together by love"(68). Through this love "a Christian . . . owns that every other Christian is by nature bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh and, by the baptism, the gospel, the charity of Christ, soul of his soul and spirit of his spirit"(69).

These descriptions do not do away with the institutional elements of the Church. "It is in vain", Skelton adds, "to expect Christian love and charity without uniformity"(70). "All sectaries labour to divide the visible Church into associations, dismembered and embittered by hatred, which frequently and to no small degree affects the peace and truth of the real Church; out of which, however, there is no salvation for him who can read or hear the word of God"(71). The "real Church" in question is to be found in the national Churches: "If in the established religion of any country wherein you dwell or but sojourn everything made necessary to your salvation by the word of God is afforded and nothing laid upon you contrary to that

word, you are an enemy of Christian peace if you do not conform to the aforesaid Church”(72). As is often the case, the episcopal structure of the visible Church is taken for granted.

In spite of the prominence of Latitudinarian bishops under the Hanoverian kings, several episcopal voices were raised, without fuss or needless polemics, in support of this conception of Catholicity. Thomas Secker (1693–1768), Archbishop of Canterbury, and himself a convert from Non-Conformity, viewed the Catholic Church as “one body” in which “there are many members”. Membership is shown by profession of “the true Catholic faith, that faith which the Universal Church received from the Apostles”(73). In his fourteenth *Lecture on the Catechism of the Church of England* Secker developed the same idea. Catholic is first defined as universal, in contradistinction to the Jewish Church which consisted of one nation only. It is defined secondly by the apostolicity of its doctrine. “The Catholic faith is the universal faith, that form of doctrine which the apostles delivered to the whole Church and it received”(74). Every single Church preserving this faith “is a part of the Catholic or universal Church; and because the parts are of the same nature with the whole, it has been usual to call every Church singly, which is so qualified, a Catholic Church”(75). Yet the Creed, the archbishop admits, gives a looser meaning to the word “catholic”: in it, “believing in the holy Catholic Church means only believing that by our Saviour’s appointment there was founded and through his mercy shall ever continue, a society of persons, of what nation or nations is indifferent, who have faith in his name and obey his laws”(76). The Creed affirms the existence of the Catholic Church; it does not identify her.

For Isaac Mann, Bishop of Cork from 1772 to 1799, “Catholic” also has a twofold meaning. In the first place, “the Church of Christ is so called because it is not confined to any place or country but takes in every nation upon earth”. In the second, “the Church is called Catholic because it ought not to admit any new and particular opinions which occasion sects and parties in religion; but to hold fast the form of sound words after the common faith, and to keep the doctrine of God our Saviour in

all things whole and entire according to the truth of the Gospel"(77). It is difficult, at this stage of Anglican theology, to discern what judgment was passed on the "Catholicity" of non-episcopal Protestant bodies. As Bishop Thomas Wilson had said, "the Church of England is the safest in which to venture our salvation"(78). Samuel Johnson, as quoted above, considers the Church of England "on many accounts the most pure and primitive Church at this day upon the face of the earth"(79). How safe it would be to venture our salvation in other Churches is harder to know. The expressions often imply that only a bishop, as the divinely appointed centre of unity, can be the visible head of a Catholic Church. According to Richard Pococke (1704-65), successively bishop of Ossory and of Meath, in Ireland, "for 5500 years at least it was ever held as an irrefragable maxim by the Catholic Church that the ministerial power to perform divine service *ex officio*, in public, was a different office from the laity"(80). By ordination a man becomes "minister of the Catholic Church", although he never is a "Catholic minister of the Church", able to exercise his ministry wherever he likes(81). By the divine commission of the episcopal office, each Church and parish under a bishop has the function reserved by the Jews for their single Temple. "The Church is Catholic or universal, and everyone of our Churches is equally God's house, as the Levitic Tabernacle or Temple was"(82).

Unity with the Catholic Church is therefore implied in unity with a bishop. Can this be carried one step further? Thomas Sikes, in the early nineteenth century, will make fidelity to one's parish the test of Catholicity. "In the present state of the Church, where there is not parochial, it will be difficult to prove diocesan communion; and where there is no diocesan communion, it will be difficult to prove any communion with the Church Catholic"(83). Sikes's startling conclusion arraigned as guilty of schism any one who frequents a parish other than his own: "Parish congregations must have their bounds, or Catholic and mutual communion cannot be maintained. . . . The *deserter* of his parish-church is a *separatist*, although he repair to another true church"(84).

Without going so far, the Hutchinsonians tended to unchurch

dissenters; William Jones displayed a savage irony when he referred to "Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Independents, and other forms, which were found so irreconcilable with each other in the age of *catholicism*, when the gates of our communion were torn off their hinges by the Puritan faction"(85). In 1775 Richard Hurd (1720-1808), Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, regretted the growth of schism, which is "always an evil and may be a crime". Yet its tolerance is a necessity in the Catholic Church. To counteract divisiveness in the first centuries, he affirmed, "no remedy occurred . . . but that the *Catholic Church* should be held together by one and the same confession; or, when, afterwards, this extensive project was found impracticable, that those who agreed in the same interpretation of the Sacred Oracles should be allowed to separate from all others and unite themselves into one distinct and *subordinate Church*"(86). Hurd was an admirer of the learned and turbulent bishop William Warburton (1698-1779), and with them Anglicanism slips toward Low-Church positions.

In the *Elements of Christian Theology* (2nd ed. 1799) of George Pretyman Tomline (1750-1827), Bishop of Lincoln, Catholicity becomes an attribute of the "mystical Church", an invisible entity made of "those persons who have truly believed and obeyed the Gospel and who are conceived, although they have lived at different periods, to be united into one body which is called mystical or invisible"(87). In this sense Tomline interprets the Nicene Creed: "Thus in the Creed we profess our belief in the Holy Catholic Church, that is, that Christ has formed all faithful Christians into one society"(88). The Catholic Church is therefore invisible and mystical; yet the word "catholic" may also be applied to a concrete, visible Church: it may, "in its most extensive sense, include all persons who are or have been, by outward profession, Christians, whether they have or have not believed all the doctrines or obeyed all the precepts of the Gospel"(89). Anyone who accepts the Christian faith belongs to this very loose, yet visible, Catholic Church. In a more restricted sense, all the visible Churches, "of Alexandria, of Antioch and of Rome . . . of England, of Holland, of Geneva", as also the

Lutheran Church, are "parts of the visible Catholic Church" (90). Catholicity has now been dissolved into multiplicity. This Latitudinarianism may be illustrated from John Randolph's lecture on *The Nature of a Christian Church*: the Catholic Church is not visible, yet includes "all Christian societies which agree on the great fundamental articles of religion" (91). Randolph's primary concern with invisible communion boomeranged: he argued against Roman Catholicism; yet he furnished Roman Catholics with a sharp weapon: "I throw together here the notion of the supremacy of the Pope and that of the Catholic Church visible here on earth. They are the same question" (92).



Several events that shook the peace of eighteenth-century Anglicanism inspired some to defend the Catholicity of the Church. After 1746, when the Hanoverian government, following the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, restricted the activities of the Scottish Episcopal clergy, a few chapels were opened in Scotland by Church of England clergymen. As these claimed to escape the jurisdiction of the Scottish bishops, they could legally open chapels. This was hardly canonical since only Scottish bishops had authority in Scotland. But in such an emergency this was, after all, of little importance and it hardly justified the furious pamphleteers' war that followed. Yet among the mass of tracts published for and against the licensed chapels, several rose above the immediate issue to a discussion of the Catholicity of the Church.

For Philanthropos, an anonymous author, "All true Protestants assert the unity of the Catholic Church to consist not only in canonical subjection to regular bishops, but also in the pure preaching of God's word, the belief of the essential doctrines of religion, in the due administration of the sacraments and the exercise of brotherly love and Christian forbearance . . . Catholic unity implies a communion in pious offices" (93). Opening chapels is a work of piety. "So far is it from being a violation of Catholic unity that it preserves it" (94). With a side-sweep at the Scottish bishops, Philanthropos condemns "domestic tyrants . . . who

fondly imagine that all the lines of Catholic unity centre in their own sacred persons". He asks, "Does Catholic unity depend on such fairy and romantic claims as would almost persuade one that a spirit of religious knight-errantry has of late been introduced into the Church?"(95).

Philanthropos's concern for unity is founded on baptism, which introduces not only into the Episcopal Church of Scotland, but also "into the communion of the Catholic Church of Christ, whereof the Church of Scotland is but a very small part"(96). What is the Catholic Church? It is "made up of many particular Churches, who hold the same faith and worship, and all these particular Churches upon all fitting occasions according to the generous and comprehensive spirit of Catholic love ought to hold visible communion with each other"(97). Loyalty is not given to particular Churches but to the universal Church. "The genuine badge of a particular Christian Church is love to all the members of the Catholic Church"(98).

Others were not so sure that the licensed chapels, unlicensed by the Scottish bishops, were in communion with the Catholic Church. "Let me ask you, sir," an anonymous writer addresses another, "where is your principle of unity to be found and to what bishop are you united?" He urges on his readers this eager advice: "You must unite yourselves to the bishops of the Church of Scotland or, which is terrible to think of, you must live out of communion of any Church throughout the whole world." Horrible though it were, it would be better still to be counted among "the members of the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland; for they own the authority of, and are in communion with, their Church, such as it is"(99). This suggestion is patently contradictory. If the bishop is the principle of unity, the Kirk cannot of course qualify as a true Church. Needless to say, the supporters of the English chapels did not seek shelter in the Kirk. They simply denied that they were out of the Church. The Rev. M. R. L., presumed author of the above, was answered anonymously: the chapels "are in union and communion with the bishops of the Church of Scotland; yea, with all the bishops of the Catholic Church where no sinful terms of communion are required"(100).

That no bishop may receive into communion the excommunicates of another is the main point that George Innes stresses. It is a matter of "Catholic principles"(101). To several opponents of the Scottish bishops the Rev. Mr A. R. and two others who hide under the pen-names of *Laius* and, rather surprisingly, of *Absalom*, George Innes explains the terms of communion that are in keeping with Catholic principles. Professing the same faith, teaching the same doctrine and using the same form of worship are not enough; one should also renounce schismatical practices and yield obedience to the national bishops(102). By virtue of the "Catholic bond of union", all bishops "as members of the one episcopate ought to ratify the regular and just sentence of another"(103). Jesus Christ established definite bonds of unity: "the profession of the one faith, the administration of the same sacraments . . . and the harmonious government of the Church by the one episcopate"(104). George Innes's ecclesiology follows lines that have recurred several times in this chapter: the Church is the sum total of all diocesan or particular Churches, grouped into national Churches and again into "the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, the one mystical body of which Jesus Christ is the head"(105). A passage of Innes's *The Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church* (1750) formulates this unequivocally:

A particular Church is a certain number of believers in Jesus Christ, united to him by his visible representative, i.e. the bishop: so that every such Church is a complete organized body within itself under its own proper head. And the Catholic or universal Church is the whole body or total sum of these particular Churches, united or confederated together by *one* faith, which they are all bound to maintain as a sacred depositum or trust committed to them, and by *one* communion, that is, the mutual obligation they are under to receive each other's communicants and to reject each other's excommunicates, and, in one word, to ratify each other's deeds as being the deeds of Jesus Christ himself, the invisible bishop, transacted by his proper local representative, in his name and by his authority(106).

This exalts each bishop in his function as successor to the Apostles and representative of Christ. It would seem logical to conclude

that each bishop, within his see, is endowed with infallibility. But is this possible? It is one thing to say, with the entire tradition, "All particular Churches are but one Church"(107). It would still be acceptable to maintain that communion with one's bishop, as the "mystical high priest" of the local Church, is "the only way to be in communion with Jesus Christ, the invisible bishop and head of the Catholic Church"(108). But it is quite another matter to attribute the total authority of the Catholic Church to each individual bishop. Disagreements with a bishop in disciplinary matters do not necessarily amount, as Innes suggests, to separation "from the whole Catholic Church in heaven and on earth"(109). Were Innes right in this, one could well conclude with the colourful words that he reads on the lips of his adversaries: "And then, *Raw-head and bloody bones!* Tyranny and arbitrary power must, infallibly, be the consequences of it"(110).

Another prominent Scottish champion of Catholic principles was John Skinner (1721-1807), priest at Longside and later Dean of Aberdeen. John Skinner was a Hutchinsonian, who devoted some of his energies to a *Dissertation on the Shechinah* and to an *Exposition of the Song of Songs*. Like all Hutchinsonians, he was a definitely High-Church man, all the more so, perhaps, as he belonged to the Church of Scotland, which remained a Non-Juring body. As a defender of the "Usages" of the Scottish Liturgy of 1765, he claimed Catholicity for his Church, "if antiquity, universality and consent be enough to give us that character"(111). He appealed to "Catholic and uncorrupted antiquity"(112). Unanimity with the past is a touchstone of Christianity: "As Christians we are not inclined to reject anything that can be proved to have been received or practised by the whole Church of Christ from the beginning. On the contrary we reckon ourselves bound to preserve unity of doctrine and worship with the first and purest ages of the Gospel"(113). Skinner understood "the great aggregate body of the Catholic Church" to be made of "national Churches with regular succession and power of discipline within themselves, independent of, but connected in the bonds of Christian faith and communion

with, one another"(114). The Church is "made up of several parts", which altogether form "a society of Christians united, as the Body of Christ, in an outward and visible form, as well as by an inward and spiritual grace"(115). The independence of Churches is not as total as George Innes made it. Each bishop is indeed "the only spiritual governor"; yet he is accountable to "the national Church, under Christ, to which he belongs"(116). This is what "Scripture and antiquity hold to be the Church Catholic"(117). Catholicity contrasts with the particularity of the Jewish Church. It is not merely a matter of geographic extension, but of potential inclusion. The Church is "intended for all nations and for containing, as worthy of being extended to all places and of being propagated in all ages, every truth necessary to be known on the subject of our eternal salvation"(118). This point is also emphasized by another John Skinner (1744?-1816), Bishop of Aberdeen: the Church is called Catholic "because it was intended to comprehend all places and to last to all ages of the world"(119).



While the principles of Catholicity were strongly asserted by all the warring parties of the Church of Scotland, several events which affected Anglican life in England had the opposite result of pointing up theological differences in the Church. Attempts to open the gates of the Establishment to the most reasonable and moderate of the Dissenters fanned the zeal of the remains of the High-Church party. Repeal of the Corporation Act of 1661 and of the Test Act of 1672 was openly discussed. These acts, which required reception of Holy Communion in the Church of England before elevation to public office, were evidently odious, even though they were not systematically enforced. But their abolition would have heralded the gradual disappearance of the privileged status of the Established Church.

The Thirty-Nine Articles also were under fire. In 1772 a petition signed by two hundred and fifty clergymen after a meeting at the Feathers' Tavern proposed to lift the obligation for the clergy to subscribe to the Articles, and to replace it with

subscription to the Bible. Presented to the House of Commons on 6th February 1772, it was rejected. Other measures for the relief of Dissenters and even of Roman Catholics were commonly discussed. The revision of the Prayer Book was also a frequent topic of conversation and argument.

Latitudinarians concurred in these proposals and Evangelicals supported some of them. The patience of High-Churchmen was sorely tried. Yet their prospects were not purely negative. The excesses of the French Revolution awakened consciences on the northern shore of the Channel. While many Evangelicals and Dissenters welcomed the fall of the Bastille on 14th July 1789, High-Churchmen and the Methodists, led by the "irregular High-Churchman" John Wesley, recoiled at such an upheaval of authority. Samuel Horsley, among others, read the Great Revolution into the Apocalypse and stigmatized "the democracy of apostate France" as "doing the work of Antichrist before he comes and preparing his way before him"(120). Christian principles were threatened, for, in spite of what naive observers contended, "the real object of the settled aversion of the atheistical conspiracy was nothing that is erroneous and exceptionable in Popery, it was everything that is good, amiable and holy in Christianity"(121).

The Great Revolution excepted, none of these incidents was world-shaking. Yet each inspired a certain amount of polemical literature. In this constant needling at the Church's privileges High-Churchmen discerned the work of Antichrist. The Feathers' Tavern petitioners and their supporters were arraigned as traitors: "With all their Hoadleian cant of setting up Christ and his Gospel as the only head and code of his Church, they are no better than determined enemies to both"(122). Such was Bishop Horsley's conviction.

There was considerable truth in this. Some of those who campaigned against subscription to the Articles were Latitudinarians who admitted all the shades of Christian opinion as legitimate forms of Catholicity. A "petitioning clergyman", in *A Letter to Josiah Tucker, Dean of Gloucester* (1773), could refer to "the Quakers, of whose Catholic spirit I have a good opinion"(123).

Others established a distinction between the Church of Christ and the Church of England that was unpalatable to High-Churchmen. Thus Benjamin Dawson, a Latitudinarian, protested: "Our design is not concerned with the Church as a national Church . . . as *such*, but only as it is a *Christian* and *Protestant* Church and, as *such*, confessedly subject to the authority of Jesus Christ alone" (124). In opposition, Samuel Hardy, rector of Little Blakenham in Suffolk, countered that subscription to a confession of faith "appears to have been the universal practice of the Catholic Church of Christ, and in the purest ages too!" (125). And Thomas Randolph, Archdeacon of Oxford, could wonder where the Church would end up once she started on the proposed path: "Perhaps in the same church one doctrine might be preached in the morning and another quite different set forth with equal authority in the afternoon?" (126). William Stevens, the Hutchinsonian, contributed *A Treatise on the Nature and Constitution of the Christian Church* (1773), "extracted chiefly from Archbishop Potter's excellent discourse concerning Church government" (127).

The core of the High-Church party, towards the end of the eighteenth century, was made of a group of friends known as the Hackney Phalanx. John James Watson (1767-1839) was Rector of a Church at Hackney, in London, which became a centre of pious concerns and good works for a distinguished group of High-Churchmen, just as Clapham did for the Evangelicals forming the Clapham Sect. The Hackney Phalanx was connected with the Hutchinsonians. J. J. Watson was a friend of William Stevens. Watson's brother, Joshua (1771-1855), a devout layman, was brother-in-law to Thomas Sikes, Vicar of Guilsborough, one of the theologians of the group. The most distinguished figure in it, from the standpoint of theological writing, was Thomas Sikes's uncle, Charles Daubeney (1745-1827), Archdeacon of Salisbury. Among other members of the Hackney Phalanx, two clergymen were, at one time or another, curates to J. J. Watson at Hackney: H. H. Norris (1771-1850) and especially W. J. Copeland (1804-85), later a friend of John Henry Newman.

The High-Church themes that have already figured in this

chapter can be illustrated from the works of Charles Daubeny: the Catholic Church is one body with many members or branches, which are the national Churches. Only episcopal Churches qualify as true branches of the Church.

The word Catholic signifies universal. The Holy Catholic Church therefore signifies the universal Church of Christ, i.e. the congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the world; all those who have gone before us in the faith of Christ, together with all those who in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord and profess the true faith. This Church is called Catholic because it is not confined to any particular nation but is open to all mankind; and is to last to the end of the world(128).

This definition does not mention episcopacy, yet Daubeny is quite sure that "where we find the order of bishops, priests and deacons regularly appointed, there we find the Church of Christ; and without these... it is not called a Church"(129). The Church is not simply any kind of spiritual fellowship, "not merely a number of people agreeing in the same articles of faith or the same acts of religious worship"(130). As a divine society it has its centre in the bishops, who have received "a branch of that commission which Jesus Christ received from his Father"(131). Individual Christians are related to the Church through the bishop. "No sooner is the centre of unity deserted than the bond of Christian fellowship by which men as members of the Church are held together is burst asunder"(132). Daubeny sums up the Catholic doctrine, as he understands it, in these words: "By the Catholic Church was heretofore understood that visible society of Christians assembled under that form of government established by apostolic authority; of which the national Church in this country constituted a conspicuous branch"(133). And again, "Every Christian society, possessing the characteristic marks of the Church of Christ, I consider to be a separate branch of the Catholic or universal visible Church upon earth"(134). Daubeny next pushed this branch-theory, if we may use such an expression, one step further in an attempt to list the branches of the Catholic Church:

The Church of England, the Church of Ireland and the Episcopal Churches of Scotland and America possess those marks. In the same

light, the Churches of Denmark, Sweden and Rome are to be considered; not to mention the great remains of the once famous Greek Church now to be found in the Empire of Russia and in the East. All these Churches constitute so many separate branches of the same Catholic Church of Christ; independent of each other so far as relates to the direction and appointment of indifferent things, as rites and ceremonies; but connected together as one body by the profession of the same fundamental articles of faith and the same divinely instituted form of government(135).

It may of course be objected that not all these Churches are in communion with each other: how then do they constitute, in their missing togetherness, the Catholic Church of Christ visible on earth? Daubeney gives a clear, if not altogether satisfactory, answer to this.

The principle remains: "If it be true that Christ formed only one Church there can be but one communion in it"(136). Despite appearances, the Church "cannot be divided into distinct and separate Churches unconnected and independent of each other. For this would destroy the unity of the Church"(137). The branches are not truly separate. Their distinction is compatible with an underlying oneness. "The unity of the Church then is that bond of communion which, in consequence of that divine covenant which is common to all its members, consolidates, as it were, all the several scattered parts or branches of the Christian Church into one connected body under the title of the Catholic Church of Christ"(138). The unity of Catholicity is essential, not empirical. It results from each episcopal Church's relatedness to Christ through its bishop's divine commission; it does not rest on accidental relations from Church to Church and from bishop to bishop. This at least seems to be the gist of the following text:

The protestantism of the Church of England consists in the right which one independent branch of the Church of Christ claims, of protesting, in its collective character, against the error of another branch of it, with which it may or may not hold communion. For by the unity of the Christian Church we do not understand a necessary communion between all branches of that Church, how-

ever dispersed or however distinguished from each other; for this must depend on circumstances; but that unity which every branch of the Christian Church possesses within itself, when all its members, being joined together in the same mind and the same doctrine, live in dutiful obedience to those who have the rule over them and in Christian fellowship with each other(139).

Daubeny's use of the word "independent" remains confusing. He both asserts and denies the "independence" of the branches of the Catholic Church. He envisions the Church's unity on two levels without always indicating which he has in mind. The Church is one in each of its branches, and also in their sum total. Of these two unities, the former is the more important:

Ecclesiastical unity is formed by that bond of communion which consolidates, as it were, the several parts or branches of the Christian Church into one connected body under the title of the Catholic Church of Christ. But that the several parts or branches of the Christian Church may be connected together, it is previously necessary that the members of each separate branch should be in communion with each other: for the communion of separate Churches with each other is but the aggregate communion of the individuals of which those Churches are composed(140).

This is not quite consistent. At times Daubeny sees Church unity as created by the bishop's institutional relation to Christ, at others by the individual members' association. At times he depicts the universal Church as a God-given unity that cannot be broken, at others as the vertical relationship to Christ of independent Churches, which subsists even when these are not in communion with each other. Unity seems to be distinct from communion. It outlives communion, as long as the separate branches of the Church remain connected through the same fundamental faith and the same divine institution of episcopacy.

Daubeny's ecclesiology is echoed by his nephew Thomas Sikes. For Sikes also "the genuine religion of Christ was first planted with episcopacy"(141) and episcopacy is of the essence of the Church. In his baroque idiom, we see "the light of the Gospel shining in the golden candlestick of an Episcopal

Church"(142). Division "into several smaller bodies" does not "prevent the catholicism of the Church: all those smaller and particular Churches constitute one Church universal, the one great fold of Jesus Christ"(143). Membership in one of them implies membership in the whole. "It follows from the universality and unanimity of the Church that he who is truly a member of *the* Church in any particular country is a member of the Church in every country"(144). Schism or separation among Christians is an offence, but "it is evident that this offence may exist *within* the Church as well as *without* it"(145). It is not always incompatible with the true unity of the Church. Where the bishops are, there is Catholic unity. "The episcopate is one and indivisible: of which each bishop holds his undivided portion"(146). "Though the Kingdom is one, the thrones are many"(147).



Though historians have often been oblivious of it, it seems clear that the eighteenth century was the theatre not only of a near-collapse, but also of a definite come-back of High-Church convictions in the Anglican communion. By the middle of the century High-Churchmanship was discredited by the political involvements of the Non-Jurors and by what appeared to be their theological eccentricities. It survived within the Establishment more as a relic from the past than as a living force. By the end of the century the situation was totally altered. Among small but influential groups like the Hutchinsonians or the Hackney Phalanx, the divine commission of bishops, the Catholicity of each episcopal Church, the authority of the Fathers in the understanding of Scripture, were cornerstones of the faith and High-Churchmanship was the sole valid interpretation of Anglicanism.

This theology stood side by side with the Protestant pietism of the Evangelicals. It could appear doomed when Methodism spread over the land. Had Methodism remained in the Establishment and coalesced with Evangelicalism, this could well have become the fate of the High-Church movement. It could have been swamped by Evangelicalism. Latitudinarianism wielded more political weight than any other school of Anglican thought.

Its ecclesiastical influence, but lightly shaken by the deistic and the Trinitarian controversies and by the polemics against the Bishop of Bangor, remained dominant among the bishops. Yet it was hardly a match with High-Churchmanship on the theological level. The balance of power between these three tendencies was, however, restored by the secession of the Methodists. Thanks to this, High-Church theology at the end of the century was much more confident than anybody could have predicted in 1750.

This confidence was not deceptive. The re-entry of the Catholic tradition upon the stage of "Church-of-Englandism" corresponded to a renewal of its interior dynamics. No doubt, it would have been impossible to foresee or even to sense such an outburst of vitality as the coming Oxford Movement was to display. Yet the Tractarians were not unheralded. Some of the churchmen whose voices have been heard in this chapter lived on in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The branch-theory that is commonly associated with the name of John Henry Newman had actually been formulated before Newman was even born(148). Thus the High-Churchmen of the second half of the eighteenth century, relatively isolated though they were, were not only the echoes of a mightier past. They were also the channels of an undying Catholic tradition, and they anticipated the glories of a more generous future.

Chapter Seven

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

Trust not the uncertain sounds of scarce three centuries, when you may listen to the concurrent voice of acknowledged wisdom and universal revered piety through all the successive ages of the Catholic Church.—Alexander Knox.

THE nineteenth century in England was dominated by the Oxford Movement. Yet the Oxford Movement as such did not last long. Beginning with a small gathering in the rectory of Hugh James Rose (1795–1838) at Hadleigh, in Suffolk, in the month of July 1833, it ended when the group of friends that had then bonded together for the defence of the Catholicity of the Church of England, broke up to go their separate ways, some pursuing their quest for Catholicity in the Church of Rome, others trying to preserve or reorganize the movement within Anglicanism. The conversion of John Henry Newman, on 8th October 1845, provides a good *terminus ad quem* for this Oxford Movement properly so called. After it one may speak of a “second generation of the Oxford Movement”, but only if one remembers that some of the outstanding figures present at the beginning no longer belong to it. This bursting asunder of Tractarianism coincided approximately with the middle of the nineteenth century. Other voices than those of the Tractarians were indeed heard in this period, even among High-Churchmen. The theology of Frederick Denison Maurice, especially, deserves to be studied in contrast with that of the Oxford men, from which it differs considerably. In the context of High-Church Anglicanism, it presented an alternative to the emphasis of the Tractarians. On the whole, however, the years 1833 to 1845 constitute the crucial years of Anglo-Catholicism, not because of Maurice’s posthumous influence, but on account of the Oxford Movement.

Yet 1833 is too late a starting-point for a study of the nineteenth century. The influence of the Hutchinsonians, still active through the Hackney Phalanx, perpetuated many Catholic ideas, if not among the mass of Anglicans, at least in select circles and parishes. As we have seen, the main conceptions of the Oxford Movement were anticipated by the Hackney group in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Since we have placed these theologians in the aftermath of the eighteenth century, we do not need to study them again; yet their contribution to the continuity of the High-Church tradition from which the Oxford Movement arose ought to be kept in mind.

(Catholic ideas, though unpopular, were accepted in many Anglican circles. This is shown not only by the Hackney Phalanx but also by the posthumous influence of the Non-Jurors on isolated High-Churchmen. That a sort of underground stream of High-Church theology flowed through many homes and rectories is accepted by all historians. Well-known High-Churchmen of the first decades of the nineteenth century transmitted conceptions that had been dear to the Non-Jurors. If they had little following in their lifetime outside of a restricted circle of friends, their writings at least testify to the existence of a type of churchmanship that was close to the coming Oxford Movement.)

★

Samuel Wix (1771-1861), Vicar of St Bartholomew-the-Less and later Archdeacon of Newfoundland, is all but forgotten today, and was never very prominent. Yet his unusual concern for the unity of the Catholic Church provides an intriguing introduction to the age of Tractarianism. In 1818 he published a little volume with a long and significant title: *Reflections concerning the expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate religious differences and to promote the unity of religion in the bond of peace; humbly but earnestly recommended to the serious attention of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, the Most Reverend the Archbishops, the Right Reverend the Bishops, the Reverend the Clergy, and all lay persons who are able and willing dispassionately to consider*

the important subject. What makes this pamphlet relevant at this point is the fact that Wix's plan for unity is restricted to the Churches of England and Rome, excluding those who are not, in his opinion, "within the pale of the visible Church"(1). It would be highly advisable to "endeavour to form an union with all other Christian Professors"(2), but this is neither possible nor desirable unless it be done on the ground of true apostolicity. Now, the Church of England is "the great reformed Church in apostolic succession"(3). And "the Church of Rome is acknowledged by the Church of England to be a true apostolical Church"(4); she is indeed "so very ancient a branch of the true visible Church of Christ"(5). They form "two great branches of the Christian Church"(6). They ought therefore to settle their differences in peace, through a Council, leaving to their errors those who do not share with them the privilege of apostolic succession.

Samuel Wix explicitly referred to the Non-Jurors, excerpts from whom he quoted in support of his suggestion. He was no idle dreamer and admitted: "The unpopularity of the proposal is manifest"(7). Yet he formulated it fearlessly: "The Roman Catholics, it is believed, are greatly misunderstood and cruelly calumniated. Truth requires this statement"(8). The theological ground for his project is obviously a concept of the Catholic Church as being the visible communion of the communities led by true bishops in apostolic succession. This was the ecclesiology of the Non-Jurors, as it will be that of the Tractarians.

Two better-known personalities should retain us longer than Samuel Wix's unpopular and unheeded project. The layman Alexander Knox (1757-1831) and John Jebb (1775-1833), rector of Abingdon, Dean of Cashel, Bishop of Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe, were linked together by friendship; and the publication of their *Thirty Years' Correspondence*, in 1836, has associated their names and their personalities to the point where their works may be treated as one whole.

The concept of Catholicity that Knox and Jebb share is quite clear from their writings. "Here are, self-evidently, two authorities", Knox comments after quoting the Athanasian Creed,

"the Christian verity and the Catholic religion. The former can mean neither more nor less than the manifest import of the written Word. What then means the Catholic religion? Can it be otherwise understood than as the concurrent and continuous voice of Tradition? What Vincentius Lirinensis calls the *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*"(9). There is a limit in time to the growth of this Catholic unanimity: about the middle of the fifth century, that is, after the period of the first councils, "the body of Catholic tradition could not but be completed: from after ages it might receive additional confirmation and perhaps elucidation; but it clearly could not receive legitimate enlargement"(10). Bishop Jebb adopts a similar standard. Individual Christians—meaning individual Anglicans—he believes, are responsible for the purity of their faith even in spite of the errors "strenuously urged by existing authorities": "As Catholic members of the Catholic Church they are to appeal from the exceptionable dictates of the present age to the recorded belief of purer times and to the concurrent voice of pious antiquity"(11). Where this pious antiquity ends brings us to the year 451, the date of the Council of Chalcedon. "A point of time is fixed, previously to which the Church of England unreservedly recognizes the guidance of the Catholic Church in the interpretation of Christian verities"(12).

The attitude of a Church towards this "point of time" determines its connection with the Catholic Church.

The Protestant communions on the continent have not so much as pretended to revere antiquity. The Church of Rome has not been wanting in the pretension; but instead of revering antiquity she has idolized herself. The Church of England alone has adopted a middle course; moving in the same delightful path and treading the same hallowed footsteps with Vincentius and the Catholic bishops and ancient Fathers; proceeding as far as they proceeded; and stopping where they stopped(13).

This definition of Anglicanism as a middle course, a *via media*, is the keynote of Bishop Jebb's understanding of Catholicity: Catholicity is antiquity. "Our Church throughout her formularies",

he asserts, "speaks of the Church Catholic in the language of antiquity, that is, in the exact forms of speech suggested by the views of Vincentius"(14). What he calls "orthodox unwavering Catholicity"(15) is this stand by antiquity; the result is "a substantive religion"(16) teaching "the faith of the true Catholic and Apostolic Church"(17).

Catholicity looks to the past. It is a "retrospective unity with the Church of old"(18); a "unity of spirit, a blessed unity of mind and heart with the whole Catholic Church, not merely with existing communities of Christians, but with that countless multitude which has passed on before"(19). But in this retrospection there is contained "a prospective unity with the Church progressive upon earth and consummated in heaven"(20). Jebb's and Knox's conception of Catholicity is rich in eschatological connotations. To be at one with the past means to be united to "those who have in all ages been translated from the Church below to the Church above, from the assembly of the saints on earth to the assembly of the first-born, in the realms of light and love"(21). Alexander Knox, anticipating the future, envisages attempts to reunite the Catholic Church: "Such a summons [i.e., to unity] supposes a *terminus ad quem* as well as a *terminus a quo*. It supposes a Jerusalem to which these emigrants from Babylon betake themselves." By that time, the Holy City will have been so well re-edified as to be recognizable by all. Knox believes that "a provision of this kind, an indubitable and authenticated centre of the Catholic Church, appears to be assured, 'a city at unity with itself, whither the tribes may go up,' where shall be 'the seat of judgment, even the seat of the House of David'." To the practical question, "Is there any prognostic of such a provision, or is there, in any part of the yet trodden down city, a visible commencement of the promised re-edification?" Knox answers that "the form, the spirit or the singular history" of the Anglican Church show her to constitute this token of future Catholicity(22). The eschatological sign is the Church of England: in her alone primitive Catholicity survives, in the form of an utter faithfulness to the unanimous teaching of the ancient Church. *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus* is

the key to Catholicity and to the future reunion of the now separated branches of the visible Church.

★

The first writings of the Tractarian Movement did not vary from the above emphasis on fidelity to the blessed antiquity of the undivided Church. A doctrine is called Catholic because at that time it was taught by the whole Church. The Church is Catholic in that it is universal, extending to all Christians. Since the first schisms, however, Catholicity can only be maintained by looking back to that past and keeping the faith as then defined. The Catholic Church in this context means primarily the Church of the Fathers, in the first five centuries or so; in a derived sense only it designates the modern Christian bodies that have preserved a minimum of fidelity to the Catholic past. This was, as Arthur Philip Perceval (1799-1853) testified, the basic principle of the Oxford Movement: "I think I owe it to myself to declare that in making with my friends the united effort in defence of the Church from whence the publication of the *Tracts for the Times* arose, my sole object was simply to defend those fundamental principles upon which the primitive and Catholic Church rested for seven hundred years"(23). On this ground, another initiator of the Movement, William Palmer, of Worcester College (1803-85) opposed the concept of doctrinal development, in which he saw a departure from "Catholic and primitive antiquity"(24). Edward B. Pusey found in it the touchstone of Anglican theology: "They [i.e. the Anglican divines] appeal to the authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one"(25). This constitutes "the Catholicity of descent against the pseudo-catholicity of usurped and corrupted dominion, the Catholicity of agreement with *quod semper, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique traditum est*, against the pseudo-catholicity of modern corruptions"(26). In Keble's famous sermon on Tradition (1836), the Vincentian canon, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, was equated with the three "tests" of "Antiquity, Universality, Catholicity"(27).

If this provided a basis for the movement of 1833, it did not imply, as some authors have said, a purely static view of the

Church(28). Tractarian ecclesiology was essentially dynamic. It did not view the Church as a static institution, but as the dynamic communion of God with men. As a communion with God, it is universal in heaven and potentially universal on earth:

Properly it [= the one Church Catholic] is not on earth, except in so far as heaven can be said to be on earth, or as the dead are still with us. It is not on earth except in such sense as Christ or His Spirit are on earth. I mean it is not locally or visibly on earth. The Church is not in time or place, but in the region of spirits; it is in the Holy Ghost; and as the soul of man is in every part of his body, yet in no part, not here nor there yet everywhere; not so in any one part, head or heart, hands or feet, as not to be in every other; so also the heavenly Jerusalem, the mother of our new birth, is in all lands at once, fully and entirely as a spirit; in the East and in the West, in the North and in the South, that is, wherever her outward instruments are to be found(29).

These outward instruments do not restrict the scope of the spiritual universality of the Church, precisely because they are only instruments, at the disposal of a universal spirit. The Catholicity of the Church was visible in the early times. Then "as is well known, all Christians thought substantially alike and formed one great body all over the world, called the Church Catholic or Universal"(30).

Thanks to this, many definitions of Catholicity mention only geographic universality, sometimes as a potential quality, sometimes as an actual mark of the Church. Thus in Perceval's *The Churchman's Manual*, written at the time of the Hadleigh Conference of 1833, Catholic is simply defined by its equivalent "universal". This in turn is taken to mean, "universal in regard to time and place, being a people taken out of all nations in all ages"; and it has also a doctrinal implication: "universal in regard to doctrine, receiving and teaching all the truth"(31). The very pedestrian William Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church of Christ* (1838), sees the universality of the Church as a "moral phenomenon: it means that "the Church was... to obtain adherents in all the nations of the world then known, and to extend its limits in proportion as new nations and countries

were discovered”(32). Others emphasize the actual extension of the Church throughout the world, as Newman does in *Tract 2*: “Doubtless the only true and satisfactory meaning is that which our divines have ever taken, that there is on earth an existing society, apostolic as founded by the apostles, catholic because it spreads its branches in every place, i.e. the Church visible with the bishops, priests and deacons”(33). “The Christian Church is so constituted as to be able to spread itself out in its separate branches into all regions of the earth; so that in every nation there may be found a representation and an offshoot of the sacred and gifted society set up once for all by our Lord after his resurrection”(34).

It was obvious to the Tractarians that Catholicity does not qualify the Church today as it did the Church of the first centuries. Newman, in *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (1837), argued from “the concordant testimony of the Church Catholic to certain doctrines”, yet recognized that “the witness of a later age would seldom come up to the notion of a Catholic Tradition, inasmuch as the various parts of Christendom either would not agree together, or when they did would not be distinct witnesses”(35). Thus Catholicity, which is essential to the Church is more hazy today: “The first centuries of Christianity enjoyed the light of Catholicity, an informant which is now partially withdrawn from us”(36). To appeal, as Pusey did, to the authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one, implies that it is no longer one. Catholicity has, in a sense, been broken. As *Tract 71*, written by Newman explains, the primitive Church appealed “to the simple fact that all the apostolic churches all over the world did agree together”; there was accordingly no cause to wonder, “Why should my own Church be more true than another?” The situation has now changed: “Neither Rome nor England can in the same sense appeal to *Catholic* testimony”(37). A polemical situation results. “While the Catholic Church is broken up into fragments”, Newman confessed in a letter of 1842, “it will always be a perplexing question, ‘What and where is the Church?’”(38). One thing is to speak of “the Catholic faith, the mind of Christ testified by His universal Church”(39), of “the ancient ways of the Church Catholic”(40), of “the old

Catholic ideas"(41), to maintain that "Catholicity is the only test of truth"(42), to oppose "two schemes of doctrine, the Genevan and the Catholic"(43), to contrast "the Catholic and heretical spirit"(44), to celebrate "that ancient Catholic spirit, which, if true at the beginning, is true at all times"(45). It is quite another problem to determine where Catholicity may be found in our times. "Both we and the Roman Catholics hold that the Church Catholic is unerring in its declarations of faith, or saving doctrine; but we differ from each other as to what is the faith, and what is the Church Catholic"(46).

"The question is", William Palmer concludes, "whether the Western Church, *separated from the communion of the Eastern as well as of the British*, is the whole Catholic Church or not"(47). Yet this is not the only question raised by the broken state of the Catholic Church. If Catholicity has been torn apart, one may also speak, as Newman does, of "the degradation and divisions of the Church"(48). One may raise the question of how Catholic a Church is. Pusey does it when he exhorts the members of the Church of England to "live up to what is evidently Catholic in her; develop, as occasion requires, those Catholic points which, though she has them, do not lie upon the surface; in a word, be raised to what our Church should be"(49). Newman confesses to an underlying anguish, which can be detected, I believe, in the writings of all the Oxford men: "I cannot deny that a great and anxious *experiment* is going on, whether our Church be or be not Catholic"(50). A contest is taking place, "on the issue" of which, Pusey fears, "hangs the destiny of our Church"(51).

In this context and against this background the so-called branch-theory is to be understood. The Tractarians had to try to solve the dilemma implied in their understanding of Catholicity. Or, if they could not solve it, they had to elaborate a theory permitting them to maintain the two contradictory statements: Catholicity is of the essence of the Church, and yet Catholicity is somehow broken. In order to do this, they simply fell back on a notion that was already current among High-Churchmen before they appeared on the theological scene, the notion of the branches of the Church. This comes ultimately from the Caroline

divines, who already understood the Church to have several, reformed and unreformed, branches. The Non-Jurors restricted the legitimate branches to Churches in the apostolic succession. In this form the theory reached the High-Churchmen of the incipient nineteenth century. The Tractarians had only to give it a more inclusive form: there are but three branches of the Church today, British, Eastern and Roman.

This was no mere expedient. The basis adopted to define Catholicity already pointed to it. If Catholicity implies fidelity to the past, to the Catholic Church before its divisions, it remains to define what minimum is required for a modern branch of Christianity to be called Catholic. One way of solving this is to identify Catholic doctrine and the Creeds: "The Catholic faith", Pusey taught, "is that faith which the Church taught universally out of the Holy Scriptures and which is embodied in the Creeds"(52). But no problem is solved, since all Churches, reformed or unreformed, claim to follow the Creeds. It does not help to make Catholic and "saving" synonymous(53), to call Catholic all doctrines necessary to salvation; for this again raises the unsettled question of what is necessary to salvation. It does not suffice to say, with Newman, "True Catholicity is commensurate with the wants of the human mind"(54), since the wants of the human minds are evidently open to question. Again, it is unsatisfactory, as a test of Catholicity, to judge from the interior influence of the Holy Spirit, as Newman suggested it in a sermon: "God's Spirit dwells in the Catholic Church and has visited the whole world. . . . And the surest test that we are members of the Catholic Church is the evidence of this Catholic influence, or religious consistency, 'casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ'"(55). This shows the inherent dynamics of Tractarian ecclesiology, but it cannot be a test of Catholicity. With his usual lucidity, Pusey perceived the difficulty: the duty of protest for the truth which the Oxford men fulfil "is not indefinite, nor another form of exercising private judgment, but opposed to it; its subject is not what any may *think* Catholic truth"(56). One

must adhere to an objective standard. Pusey found in the articles of the Creed the rock of the Catholic protest; yet this itself is not beyond cavil.

By selecting the doctrine of apostolic succession as the cornerstone of Catholicity, recognizable by all, the Tractarians did not innovate. Apostolic succession had been a watchword of High-Churchmanship since the Restoration. The Elizabethan and the Caroline divines had emphasized it over against the Continental Reformers. If it was not a prominent doctrine at the end of the eighteenth century, it was not forgotten by theologians, even though the mass of the people were little acquainted with it. Be that as it may, Perceval summed up Tractarian unanimity when he listed, at the head of the doctrines "which may in the highest sense be termed Catholic", that of apostolic succession, followed by baptismal regeneration and Eucharistic service. These are, in the highest sense, Catholic, because "having warrant in Holy Writ, i.e. in the inspired records of the Church, [they] have been witnessed to from the beginning also in the uninspired records, and taught authoritatively by all branches of the Catholic Church in its decrees, liturgies and rituals"(57). The Tractarians were aware of the difficulties ahead of them when they chose to fight for apostolic succession. In *Tract 38*, composed by Newman, Clericus asks Laicus, "What is the popular opinion now concerning the necessity of an Episcopal Regimen?" Laicus answers: "A late incident has shown what it is; that it is uncharitable to define the Catholic Church as the body of Christians in every country, governed by bishops, priests and deacons; such a definition excluding pious Dissenters and others"(58). Once this had been selected as the battle-ground for Catholicity the branch-theory in its strictly Tractarian form followed naturally: only those Churches fulfil the minimal requirement to be acknowledged as branches of the Catholic Church today, which have preserved apostolic succession. The definition given in *The Prophetic Office of the Church* follows: "By Church Catholic we mean the Church Universal as descended from the Apostles"(59). Since there is no descent from the Apostles without apostolic succession through episcopal consecration, this

leaves three modern branches of the Catholic Church: the East, England, and Rome. Among these, as seen by all Tractarians, at the beginning at least of their movement, Rome teaches "more than the truth", being similar in this, says Perceval, to "New Jerusalemites or Swedenborgians, Southcotians, Irvingites"(60). On the contrary, the Church of England has been "placed as the single guardian of Catholic truth of the West"(61).

This conception of Catholicity was shared by all Tractarians at the beginning. It was echoed far and wide outside the small circle of contributors to the *Tracts*. Personalities that are little known today endorsed it fully, either because it tallied with the doctrines which they themselves had inherited as part of their High-Churchmanship, or because they were convinced by the Oxford men. Henry Arthur Woodgate (1801-74) made it the centre of his Bampton Lectures for 1838, on *The Authoritative Teaching of the Church shown in conformity with Scripture, analogy and the moral constitution of man*, which were explicitly devoted to "the now urgent advocacy of Catholic principles"(62). It was taught by John Jebb (1805-86), curate of East Farleigh, in *The Divine Economy of the Church* (1840). Either because it was there already, or because it found its way abroad, the same ecclesiology was formulated in remote sections of the Anglican communion. Francis Russel Nixon (1803-79), Bishop of Tasmania, included it in his *Lectures, historical, doctrinal and practical, on the Catechism of the Church of England*(63). At the matriculation of students at General Theological Seminary in New York City, 29th November 1840, Benjamin Onderdonk, Bishop of New York, preached on Christian unity: to know if we are "members of the one, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church", we should "bring the ministry, sacraments, worship and faith of the body of Christians of which we profess membership, to the test of Scripture and primitive catholicity". If they are in accord, we belong to the Catholic Church, "divided into distinct portions or branches", each of which "is to preserve its unity with the others and with the whole, by preserving the divinely appointed ministry and sacraments...". Thus "the different national branches of the Catholic Church" are held together(64).

That this is a static ecclesiology can be concluded only if the institutional elements of it—the identification of the three branches of the Church Catholic—are separated from the spiritual motivation of the Tractarians. An overemphasis on the sacramental channel of apostolic succession—the imposition of hands by bishops, transmitting their Order down the ages—may be detected in many passages. Yet the *Tracts* in general as well as the main theologians of the Oxford Movement in their other writings, wanted to convey the conviction that the Spirit leads the Church spiritually rather than mechanically. They insisted on visible instruments of this guidance simply because these, as they felt, were neglected in their Church; yet they strongly maintained the primacy of the Holy Spirit. As we have seen, Newman defined Catholicity in relation to the Spirit in his great sermon on “the Communion of Saints”. In *Tract 89*, on “the mysticism attributed to the early Fathers of the Church”, which constitutes a powerful plea for the spiritual interpretation of the Bible, John Keble (1792–1866) found the standard of Catholic interpretation in the Spirit of Christ, who inspires the faith of the Church:

The Catholic faith, the mind of Christ testified by His universal Church, limits the range of symbolical interpretation both in Scripture and in nature: the Protestant watchword, *Verbum Dei*, must be made primitive by the constant addition, *Verbum Deus*. . . . In other words, the analogy of faith, Christ set before us in the creeds of the Church, will give a fixedness and reality to our symbolical interpretations, how wide soever in other respects the latitude and variety which seems to be allowed in them(65).

This is Catholicity in terms of a dynamic following of the Spirit that speaks through the Church. The Oxford men were attuned to this eschatological dimension of Catholicity. They understood it to mean, not only that, in the words of John Jebb, “the Church is Catholic or universal because all the blessed shall hereafter belong to it in heaven”(66), but furthermore that the heavenly fullness where Christ is all in all is inchoate in each member of the Church.

Catholic truth [Pusey wrote in 1839 to the Bishop of Oxford] is indeed so intrinsically practical that it is less exposed than any

human system, however apparently spiritual, to be received as a mere theory. . . . It is of the very nature of Catholic truth to merge self, and with it the extravagancies of self, in the sense of being a member of Christ in the communion of His glorious saints. . . . One has begun probably by one portion of the system, another by another, as Providence guided his disposition or his circumstances; yet as he took up, one by one, increasing duties, he found himself but filling up voids in himself. . . . (67).

The systematic aspect of this vision of Catholic truth did not detract from its dynamic spirituality.

The so-called "static" elements of Tractarianism stress the power of bishops, its transmission through the imposition of hands, the continuity of episcopal succession as necessary to the being of a Church. These are objectionable to the Protestant mind, which frequently connects ecclesiological freedom with fidelity to the Word and the Spirit. Yet the great crisis of the Oxford Movement did not arise from this institutional emphasis. It grew from the spiritual concerns of the Oxford men, or, more exactly, from the perception, first by some of the lesser men of the Movement, then by Newman himself, of a discrepancy between their spiritual conception of Catholicity and its institutional embodiment in Anglicanism. This discrepancy was actually at the basis of the movement: Keble's moderate discourse on "the national apostasy" on Bastille Day of 1833, would have found little echo, had not many minds more or less consciously asked themselves, with the author of *Tract 58*: "Is he [= the dark spirit of evil] not daily tempting ourselves to regard the Church, a true branch of the Church Catholic, established on these Islands, as a mere human institution?" (68) There should be no gap between the visible and the invisible elements of the Church, if indeed Newman was right to preach that the difference is no greater than between concave and convex in a curve line, "which, looked at outwardly, is convex, but looked at inwardly, concave" (69). Yet the evidence of a contradiction between the nature of Catholicity and "that arrogant Protestant spirit, so-called, of the day", made Newman exclaim: "As seeing that this spirit is coming on apace, I cry out betimes, whatever comes of it, that

corruptions are pouring in, which sooner or later will need a Second Reformation"(70).

★

The events which occasioned the break between a section of the Oxford men and the Church of England are too well known to bear repetition. Men who had hoped that the Roman Catholic "branch may yet be reabsorbed into the purer portion of the one Holy Catholic Church"(71) were bound to be shaken if the Church of England behaved in a way which they did not consider worthy of the purer portion of the one Holy Catholic Church. Whether or not they were correct in taking a tragic view of such relatively small happenings as the suppression of outdated Irish sees or the creation of the Jerusalem bishopric need not concern us. What is important is that the external occasions of the crisis challenged an inner tendency of the Oxford movement from the beginning, namely its concern, not only for apostolic institutions, but also for holiness of life.

Already in *The Prophetical Office of the Church* Newman insisted that the special need of the day was not so much for learning as for "a sound judgment, patient thought, discrimination, a comprehensive mind, an abstinence from all private fancies and caprices and personal taste—in a word, divine wisdom"(72). This wisdom is given to few: "Virtue lies in a mean, is a point almost invisible to the world, hard to find, acknowledged but by the few"(73). "We are within the divine dispensation; we cannot take it in with the eye, ascertain its proportions, pursue its lines, foretell their directions and coincidences, or ascertain their limits"(74). Catholicity grows; it implies what Newman later will call a development. This development is not primarily doctrinal, but spiritual; it does not concern first the formulations of doctrines, but their experiential anticipation in holiness of life. The "purity" which the Tractarians expected of the Church Catholic was a holiness and the evidence of its increase, both in individual members as God gives it to them, and collectively, the fruit of the Church's nearness to the Holy Spirit.

While this was common to all the Oxford men in the first years of the movement, some of the younger and perhaps more

extreme ones carried this to the point where their search for the holiness of the Catholic Church became indistinguishable from a systematic criticism of the English reformation and of things Anglican in general. Hurrell Froude, whose *Remains* caused a furore when Newman and Keble published them in 1839, did not hesitate to posit the following alternative: "The body of the English nation either are sincere Christians or they are not: if they are, they will submit to Discipline as readily as the primitive Christians did. If not, let us tell the truth and shame the devil: let us give up a *national* Church and have a *real* one"(75). Intransigence and the will to go to the end of one's rigid logic became a mark of this extreme wing of the Oxford Movement. Froude's editors described the true Catholic mind as "the mind of a person determined not to flinch from results"(76); such a mind is "thoroughly uncompromising in its Catholicity"(77). William Ward wanted to follow "the course which leads to full, consistent and complete Catholicism"(78). William Palmer (1811-79) of Magdalen College, suggested in his *Letter to a Protestant Catholic* (1842) that his High-Church anonymous critic and, with him, many Anglicans, actually "*profess Catholicism* upon a Protestant principle, that is, a new Catholicism covering its novelty under an equivalent expression and really according to the old sense of the word *anti-catholic*"(79). Palmer's criticism of the English religious system was neatly summarized and apparently approved by Newman: the English people's governors "have shut her [= the Church] up within walls, that, if so be, she might cease to be Catholic"(80). William Ward made a similar point in 1836: "Ever since the State took on itself the care and disposal of the Church, it has been very jealous of its forming foreign relations or advancing one step towards the realization of that Catholicity which is an essential element of the Christian Spirit"(81). Once the discussion had taken this turn, anything could be expected. The search for unholy aspects of the Anglican Establishment, which had antecedents among the Non-Jurors, did not require, after all, much investigation. William Ward criticized all English claimants to Catholicity: "Surely no one, Anglican or Roman, can maintain that anywhere in England

is Catholicism exhibited so purely and genuinely before the world, as to force on ordinary minds the perception of its true character"(82). But his strictures on Anglicanism had a still sharper edge: "I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation"(83).

What made these young men so bitter was simply that whereas they were searching for a more perfect Catholicity, they did not see such a search being encouraged, let alone endorsed, by the Church of England of their time. The direction of their thought in this quest appears clearly enough in their writings. Froude died too young to give final shape to his conceptions. Yet his interest in the Middle Ages indicates in what direction he was seeking. Keble, William Palmer, of Worcester College, and most of the Oxford men found their inspiration in the Caroline divines and the Fathers of the Church; Newman and Pusey, using the same sources, gave more importance to the Fathers; Froude was, in his religious practices, a medievalist. He appealed to the primitive Church, but saw it largely through his profound admiration for the Middle Ages. Catholicism was for him a "great principle"(84) yet, it should be admitted, somewhat undefined and vague. It was, to borrow expressions from the *preface* to Froude's *Remains*, "*less tangible and definite, though not less real*"(85) than could be wished. It nevertheless "demands dutiful veneration" and a Catholic mind is "bound to conform himself in practice" to it. It is described in these eloquent yet evasive terms: "the cast of thought and tone of character of the primitive Church, its way of judging, behaving, expressing itself on practical matters, great or small, as they occur. For what in fact is this character, but what an Apostle once called it—the 'Mind of Jesus Christ' Himself, by the secret inspiration of His Spirit communicated to His whole mystical body, informing, guiding, moving it as He will"(86).

(William Palmer, of Magdalen, contrasting the Catholic and the Protestant principles, tried to prove that the Church of England was on the side of the Catholic principle. His *Letter to*

a Protestant Catholic (1842) described "a certain Catholic principle of dogmatic and traditional authority in the hierarchy" (87). This sense of dogmatic authority implies no restriction of Christian liberty, but gives Catholic liberty a different character than the sort of freedom which Protestants claim. Palmer went as far as to see in this "the essential distinction between a Catholic and a Protestant". The difference is "that with the Catholic any opposition to any portion or degree of the apostolic episcopate has more or less the nature of an appeal to the next higher authority, while the Protestant claims to follow his own interpretation as a right, independently of the whole episcopate" (88). Following this intuition, Palmer, in *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church of the East* (1846), identified Anglican doctrine, as selected from a number of High-Church authors, with Eastern Orthodox teaching.

(Although he was not closely connected with the Oxford men, Henry Edward Manning (1808-92) shared their Catholic concerns and deserves to be considered here: his formulation of the Catholic principle, as it appeared in 1842 in his volume *The Unity of the Church*, implied a similar search for a more perfect Catholicity. The institutional aspects of Catholicity are strongly emphasized in it: "In every several Church, the successor and representative of the apostles is the visible centre, type, source and bond of unity" (89). Organic unity is impossible without "the one origin, the one succession, and the one college of the apostolic bishops" (90). This is as strongly-worded as anything that the main writers of the Oxford Movement ever wrote; yet it is not particularly significant, since it belongs to the heritage of the Non-Jurors and the High-Church party. What Manning calls the "moral" unity of the Church is more relevant to this study. Moral unity is for him the Catholic cohesion, the co-inherence of all in one mind or in one spiritual attitude. "It is often called the unity of communion. The basis of this unity is the subjective state of the moral character and the union of Christian men in the habits of faith, hope and charity" (91). The Catholic character of this moral unity comes from the fact that it is intended by God to fulfil one of his main purposes in creating man.

"This moral unity is evidently a law, not only of the Church and of revelation, but of nature and of the constitution of mankind. The moral unity of a family is the aboriginal type and the national unity of a people a partial antitype of the same mystery, which has its perfect fulfilment in the Catholic Church alone"(92). With Manning, the Catholicity of the Church has cosmic range: "The function of the Church was to restore to mankind a principle of moral cohesion"(93). By the same token, it is an eschatological sign raised above all the nations: "It is evident that the unity of the Church is, as it were, the restored unity of the primordial creation. It is the will of God re-impressing itself as at the first upon the creatures from which it had been erased"(94). "The unity of the Church is in very deed the unity of God's primordial work; and is the means of sustaining in man the image of God in which he was created"(95). One cannot object that this implies a deification of the Church as an institution. For the Church exists only through its union with the Saviour: "The unity of the Church may be viewed as the one all comprehending sacrament of the person of Christ, from the side of which holy baptism and holy eucharist flow forth as the water and the blood"(96). Since it has all these paramount qualities and it is the very centre of the Christian revelation, Manning concludes boldly: "This moral power [of the cohesion of the Church] is a miracle as great as the perpetual sustaining of the frame of creation and as the continuous energy of the divine will, which 'hangeeth the world upon nothing'"(97).

(None of the Tractarians approached the forcefulness of Manning's formulas and the cosmic grandeur of his theology of Catholicity. Yet their conception had its own magnificence. It is not immediately apparent in the occasional writings of most of them, and many of the *Tracts* were too polemical to remain at a high level of spiritual persuasiveness and to maintain the serenity of profound Catholic vistas. The Oxford man who comes nearest to the grand view of Manning's *Unity of the Church* is also the most maligned. The works of William George Ward have been rated by many as crackpot productions, especially since the publication in 1844 of *The Ideal of a Christian Church*.

Ward was a tempestuous genius who never did things by half. Being in search of Catholicity, he wanted it "full, consistent and complete"; and he wanted it at any cost, as he suggested in this deliberately unclear utterance:

How far, should we ever succeed in carrying out, even to a limited degree, the non-distinctive principles of the English Church—those, I mean, which High-Churchmen hold in common with the whole Catholic world—the said "distinctive" principles will be found to possess any solid existence whatever;—this is a question on which I have my own very definite opinion, but which I would most gladly leave to be determined by the event(98).

(Many readers did not hesitate to conclude that Ward identified Catholicism and Romanism and actually strove to wreck the Church of England.) Some of the more moderate Oxford men even drew this conclusion, as for instance William Palmer (of Worcester), referring to Ward's articles in *The British Critic*(99).

William Ward's doctrine was not as simple as that. He did not feel free to give his own meaning to the word "Catholic": "The case of a term such as Catholic", he wrote in *The British Critic*, "...possessing a scriptural meaning which we cannot give up, cannot apply to that of a simply human word, over which human opinion has complete power"(100). Unlike his critic Palmer, who never entertained a doubt about the Church of England, Ward perceived how ambiguous the term becomes when it is a matter of deciding between claims to Catholicity: Is the Church Catholic "the Church in communion with Rome, or the mere multitude of professing Christians poured over all countries, or the Church episcopal throughout the world, or the established Church in various countries"?(101) (Ward knew what Catholicity was and, despite his critics, it was neither Romanism nor any kind of institutionalism. Students of the Oxford Movement often do not perceive the specific point which forms the core of *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, the magnificent development of which makes this book, in spite of its occasional dreariness and its many repetitions, a truly magnificent work. "Catholicism", Ward tells us, "is something moral

and spiritual, not formal, external, circumstantial; in doctrine, in principle, ever one and the same; but elastic and pliant to adapt itself to all conceivable circumstances, vigorous and full of life to cope with all conceivable emergencies"(102). Its unmistakable sign is the holiness of the Church or, more exactly, her eagerness to be a guide to holiness.) Precisely, Catholicism exhibits "a wonderful harmony of parts, depth of view and consistency of progress"; it is "the majestic and wonderful development of a real idea"; it shows "a surprising suitableness to human nature under certain aspects"(103); yet the true "love of Catholic doctrine" comes from something else, "a most deep and experimental conviction that this doctrine gives help, such as no other doctrine in the world can give, towards rescuing the soul from the power of Satan and promoting its progress in every Christian virtue"(104). One arrives at Catholic convictions by building on "conscience and on faith" not on "history and antiquity"(105).

(Catholicism requires the good balance of all Christian elements. It implies "unity in doctrine throughout all ages"; Catholicity, or "its proclaiming one and the same message in all lands"; apostolicity or "its referring back to some signal interference with the visible course of things from the 'world beyond the veil'"(106). Above all it implies sanctity. *The Ideal of a Christian Church* unites all and neglects none. On each of these points, Ward professed to find a closer approximation to the Ideal in the Roman Catholic than in the English Church. The Church of England is so remote from antiquity that, in his opinion, "surely it is in mockery that our Church is ever called primitive and patristic"(107).) By passing judgment on the "corruptions" of Rome, she practically denies the unity which she professes in theory. She provides little help towards sanctity, and her leaders show scant awareness of this aspect of their function. Her claim to apostolic succession cannot counterbalance her deficiency elsewhere. In thus criticizing the Church of England, Ward did not consider himself disloyal. He was simply faithful to the nature of Catholicity: "The true Catholic character exists, is irresistibly attracted towards the image of itself"(108).) A few months after publishing *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, Ward was received

into the Roman Catholic Church. I am not aware of any adequate refutation of his book, then or since.

★

John Henry Newman never identified himself with the younger party within the Oxford Movement, even though its representatives constantly appealed to the authority of his influential name. Until the controversy that followed the publication of *Tract 90* forced him to retire to Littlemore, he exercised, on the whole, a moderating action on the extremists. This long period of quiet reflection led him to travel all the way with them, to despair of ever bringing the Church of England to a more perfect Catholicity, to give up the claim to Catholicity which was essential to his remaining an Anglican and, in order to be fully Catholic himself, to ask for admission in the Roman Catholic Church. William Ward had already taken this step. Others among the less prominent radicals followed Newman, like J. D. Dalgairns (1818-76), F. Oakeley (1802-80) and F. W. Faber (1814-63) in 1845. William Palmer (of Magdalen) did the same thing ten years later.

Newman's evolution from his High-Church positions of 1833 to his radical Catholicism of 1845 did not entail a sudden departure from previous convictions. Already in 1835, when the movement, growing and already well established, was still young, his later position appeared to him as a possibility. This at least is the way I understand his remarkable article of *The British Magazine*, "How to Accomplish it". This article is presented as a report, by Cyril, who speaks in the first person, of a conversation with Ambrose and with a third one, Basil, who joins them later. In the main, Cyril represents moderate High-Church positions; Ambrose is a radical; Basil, a "great theorist" (109), somehow mediates between them.

Ambrose's definition of Catholicity undermines the Anglican position from the start. Referring to primitive Christians, who understood the Church to be "one vast body founded by the apostles and spreading its branches out into all lands" to be everywhere the only channel of grace and the mystical vine,

Ambrose concludes: "In this Church there can be no divisions. Pass the axe through it and one part or the other is cut off from the apostles. There cannot be two distinct bodies, each claiming descent from the original stem. Indeed, the very word *catholic* witnesses to this. Two apostolic bodies there may be without actual contradiction of terms; but there is necessarily but one body Catholic"(110). This could be compatible with the High-Church positions of a man like William Palmer (of Worcester). Yet in this context it excludes the branch-theory, for Ambrose considers it indisputable that Rome has a previous claim to Catholicity: "Surely, there is such a religious *fact* as the existence of a great Catholic body, union with which is a Christian privilege and duty. Now we English are separate from it"(111). "I am only contending for the *fact* that the communion of Rome constitutes the main body of the Church Catholic and that we are split off from it"(112). Facing this great Catholic body, "the Church of England is not a body now, it has little or no substantiveness; it has dwindled down to its ministers"(113).

Turning his attention to High-Church theology Ambrose finds it totally impossible: "The Anglican principle is scarcely fair, as fastening the Christian upon the very first age of the Gospel for the evidence of all those necessary developments of the elements of Gospel truth, which could not be introduced throughout the Church except gradually. On the other hand, the Anglican system itself is not found complete in those early centuries; so that the principle is self-destructive"(114). One cannot claim Catholicity of doctrine and feel bound only by the early centuries of the Church, for the doctrine of the early Church demanded developments that could take place only later. Anglicans have "a very shallow philosophy", or they would not try to "prevent the completion of given tendencies". In a word, Romanism would be "the inevitable result of a realized Anglicanism, were it ever realized"(115). It is not explicitly said, but there is more than a hint, that the only aim of a movement for the defence of Catholicity must be to reunite England to Rome.

In their defence of Anglican High-Churchmanship, Cyril and Basil argue for the perennity of the Catholic nature of the

Church in spite of the actual trend of the majority away from it. "Forms are transitory—principles are eternal; the Church of the day is but an accidental development and type of the invisible and unchangeable. It will always have the properties of truth . . . but its policy and measures will ever vary according to the age"(116). In other words, Catholicity is not, as Ambrose takes it, a matter of visible fact, but of invisible principle. The aim of a Catholic movement is not union with Rome; it is bringing to light the Catholic nature of the Church of England. This may not be feasible for the whole Establishment, but no matter: "We can afford to give up the greater part of England to the spirit of the age, and yet develop in a diocese or in a single city those principles and tendencies of the Caroline era which have never yet arrived at their just dimensions"(117). From there, Catholic practices and doctrines will spread. This process may take a long time, but says Basil, "*I am* looking forward to events as yet removed from us by centuries. . . . We are consulting for no affairs of the day; we are contemplating our fortunes five centuries to come. We are labouring for the year 2500"(118). Cyril also looks ahead into the future: "Our generation has not yet learned the distinction between Popery and Catholicism. But, be of good heart; it will learn many things in time"(119).

When he wrote "How to Accomplish it", Newman was still undisturbed in his Anglicanism. This changed rapidly. His article of January 1840, on "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church" was, as Newman later testified(120), directed against Rome. Yet the position of Newman is now notably different from that of Cyril and Basil in the article of 1836. Newman in 1840 is outspokenly anti-Roman; but he is puzzled, as is shown by the alternatives he proposed and the dilemmas he states. Anglo-Catholic theology is summed up: "We go by Antiquity; that is, by the Apostles. Ancient consent is our standard of faith." The Roman Catholic view follows: "We go by Catholicity. Universal consent is our standard of faith"(121). The Anglican and the Roman views are again contrasted: either (Anglican) "the Church Catholic can go wrong"; or (Roman) "the faith of ages may be remodelled"(122). Newman tries to make recognition

of the Catholicity of the Church of England an essential ingredient of Catholicity: "Unless the English Church be a Catholic branch, the Catholic Church is defrauded of the *orbis terrarum*"(123). Yet he admits that the Anglican Church is schismatic: "Our Church may be a true but a schismatical branch of the Catholic body, though ever so legitimately descended from the apostles"(124). That Newman is disturbed appears in statements that all but contradict one another: "Catholicity", he says, "and not the Pope, is the essence of the Church"(125). Yet he has just written that the essence of the Anglican Church "consists in her descent from the Apostles"(126), which is exactly the reason why the Papacy claims to belong to the essence of the Catholic Church. Facing the Roman Catholic communion, Newman now defines the Anglo-Catholic position as based on three points: "One point is acknowledged, one must be conceded, and one will be maintained, by all Anglo-Catholics: that the Church is one is the point of *doctrine*; that we are estranged from the body of the Church, is the point of *fact*; and that we still have the means of grace among us, is our point of *controversy*"(127). His conclusion is now a far cry from the heavy Anglican assertiveness of a man like William Palmer. It is almost timid: "We are almost content to say to the Romanists: Account us not yet as a branch of the Catholic Church, though we be a branch, till we are like a branch, so that when we do become like a branch, then you consent to acknowledge us"(128). Anglican Catholicity must become more visible than it now is; but the question remains, how to accomplish it.

The dilemma in which Newman was caught between theory and appearance, was thickening. "For eight years I have been writing", he confided to his correspondent J. W. Bowden (1799-1844), "either to *prove* or on the ground that we *are* a branch of the Catholic Church"(129); and now all this work was threatened by the proposed Jerusalem bishopric. The plan was nevertheless carried out. In 1843, Newman admitted to a friend, J. B. Mozley (1813-78), that since 1839, when he was studying the Monophysite controversy, he had felt that "we were external to the Catholic Church"(130). In 1844 he had no doubt

any longer: "I believe our Church to be separated from Catholic communion" (131). Newman then did for himself what Ambrose, the fictitious character of "How to Accomplish it", proposed to do for the whole Church of England.



The Oxford Movement met with resistance not only among Evangelicals, who found it too formalist and legalistic, and among Latitudinarians, who denounced its anti-liberalism, but also among High-Churchmen. These, the inheritors of the defunct Non-Juring bodies, had been naturally prone to endorse it when it began: the movement corresponded to the secret or avowed wishes of many. Yet the most powerful theological opposition to the Oxford men did not come from the Evangelicals, who were too far from it to be able to understand it, or from the Latitudinarians, who were not equipped to treat it as anything but a crypto-Romanism. The objections of Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-72) were much more powerful, presumably because they started from definitely High-Church positions.

Maurice was not a High-Churchman in the sense in which this word has been taken so far in this book, although he was perhaps not the creator of a new type of High-Churchmanship. We find a position similar to his own under the pen of Richard Whately (1787-1863), Archbishop of Dublin, who himself had evolved from Classical High-Church positions: "I am myself", Whately wrote, "a Catholic, and a Baptist, and a Unitarian; and, I trust, both Orthodox and Evangelical: but I will never assume any of these titles as terms of distinction from such as do not professedly differ from me on the several points which are in question respectively" (132). In other words, a type of High-Churchmanship which claimed to be all things to all men was taking shape. This was the explicit theme of Maurice's main work, *The Kingdom of Christ, or Hints to a Quaker respecting the Principles, Constitutions and Ordinances of the Catholic Church* (133).

The first point made in the preface to the first edition is that nobody today can escape the question of Catholicity. All shades of thought are led to wonder "whether there is not, or has not

been, or shall not be, a Catholic Church”(134). Maurice implicitly acknowledges the influence of the Oxford Movement, in his *Three Letters to the Rev. William Palmer* (of Magdalen)(135):

This is a question which twenty years ago people might not have proposed to themselves, or might not have thought practically important; though even then the answer would have been nearly unanimous, at least as to words: “A Church is by its nature Catholic.” Now this subject is forcing itself upon the thoughts of everyone. It cannot be put aside; it cannot be treated as of mere theoretical interest. The cry has gone forth; this Catholicity is no accident of the Church, but her essence; if she has it she must act upon it(136).

The question is, how is the Church Catholic? What is Catholicity? Maurice finds three main conceptions of Catholicity: one looks for it in the past; another in the present; a third in the future. But true Catholicity, for him, is all three together: “Only in the union of the three can we find a Church which shall satisfy the wants of a creature who looks before and after, shall present the image of an order abiding from generation to generation, and be a mirror of him which was and which is and which is to come”(137). What this means in practice forms the core of Maurice’s doctrine. Unfortunately his expressions at this point are singularly vague.

“The Catholic Church is emphatically a kingdom for *mankind*, a kingdom grounded upon the union which has been established in Christ between God and man”(138). This “great idea of Church, one, indivisible and imperishable”(139) is inseparable from the knowledge of the true God. Indeed, “the Church is that society which rests upon the Name and Unity of God, and through which they were made known to man”(140). Catholicity will therefore be the unity of all men in the worship of the true Name of God. If “the main and characteristic glory of the Church is precisely this, that it is brought into the Holiest of the Holies, not into the figure of the true, but into the presence of God himself”(141), then what applies to the Church as a whole applies also to each of its members: “The principle of the Catholic Church . . . is the principle of a direct, real and practical union between men and their Lord”(142). Roman Catholicism is not

Catholic enough, since it introduces mediators between God and men. True Catholicism is actually Protestant. We have to discover "what Catholicity is, how necessary it is to the support of Protestantism, how impossible it is that it can thrive without Protestantism"(143). "I found him [i.e. William Palmer] affirming that if our Church would be Catholic, she must not be Protestant. I said she must be Protestant first, in order to support her nationality; secondly, in order that she might preserve those institutions which Mr Palmer and I agreed in considering Catholic, and that she might give those institutions their highest and most spiritual meaning"(144). Maurice "feels the importance of the Protestant principle, and that its true home is in the Catholic Church"(145). The Catholic Church must be Protestant. Yet Protestantism does not always perceive "that Christ's Church is a kingdom and not merely a collection of sects bound together in the profession of particular dogmas"(146). This has been the special testimony of the Church of Rome, and it is essential to the Catholicity of the Church. The pending question concerns the centre around which the Church is gathered.

Here is the turning point of the whole controversy; men want a centre—they say unity without a centre of unity is a contradiction and impossibility. It must be a real centre, not a dogma, not a set of dogmas, whether conceived by ourselves or transmitted by others; every institution must express and manifest this centre; it must transcend all notions and opinions, yet it must have such a connection with the heart of man, as no notions or opinions ever can have. . . . I will endeavour to show you that I am a Protestant just because I do acknowledge this Catholic centre, and that the moment I relinquish my protestantism, that moment I abandon the best hopes for the unity of the Church(147).

This centre is Christ himself. This is "the very principle upon which the Catholic Church stands: that all unity is to be in Christ, and that intellectual notions and opinions ought not to divide men from him"(148). It resides in no single concrete Church: "Romanist, Protestant nations, sects all . . ."(149).

Maurice is far from denying the marks of the visible Church. On the contrary, *The Kingdom of Christ* defines the marks of

Catholicity, which it professes to find in Baptism, the Creed, Worship and the Ministry. Maurice therefore maintains the visibility of the Catholic Church: "A body acknowledging itself connected with the Church in all previous ages by the bonds of sacraments, of creeds, of worship, of ministerial succession, has the *prima facie* marks of catholicity"(150). Catholicism is a principle, not a system. "I cannot see", Maurice admitted, "what Catholicism reduced to a system is, but Romanism"(151). And he explained the distinction in this way: "I do not think the system is the extension or expansion of the principle, but its limitation and contradiction. I do not see how the principle can be carried too far. I do not see how anything can be done towards the formation of the system, without introducing a seed of evil which must germinate till it produces all its natural fruits"(152).

Maurice's thought is hard to grasp and to summarize. It is also expressed through impossibly long and tedious considerations and is couched in one of the most awkward styles that English theology has produced. Yet we shall not be far from the mark if we conclude that Catholicity, as Maurice understands it, concerns primarily the mission of the Church. Maurice wanted to stress that the Church is destined for all mankind. It is, in the purpose of God, mankind reconciled to him. "The Church is human society in its normal state; the world, that same society irregular and abnormal. The world is the Church without God; the Church is the world restored to its relation with God, taken back by him into the state for which he created it"(153). "I believe", Maurice wrote, "that this Universal Church is the only true society for men as men—the only body which declares to us what Humanity is, and what a false, spurious, anomalous thing that *World* is, which is based upon individual selfishness, in which each man is his own centre"(154). What form the Church will take, when she has been acknowledged by mankind as the true society of men, is a mystery. The chance is that all forms of Christianity have anticipated some aspects of it.

There rose before me the idea of a Church Universal, not built upon human inventions or human faith, but upon the very nature

of God himself and upon the union which he has formed with his creatures: a Church revealed to man as a fixed and eternal reality by means which infinite wisdom has itself devised. The tokens and witnesses of such a Church, it seemed to me, must be divine, but the feeling of its necessity, apprehensions of the different sides and aspects of it, must, if it be a reality, be found in all the different schemes which express human thought and feeling(155).

Maurice excludes nothing from Catholicity. How all will eventually be reconciled in the Church of the future is a mystery of which he can only provide "hints". But he is confident that once this Catholicity is recognized, the great step will have been taken toward opening the Church to all men. In this way, Catholicity lies in the future. We must confess now in words and in deeds that "a Spirit has appeared to build up a One, Holy, Catholic Church"(156).

The Tractarians, intent as they were upon building Anglicanism as a Catholic system, were at odds with Maurice. Maurice criticized their endeavours, in which he found the narrowness of a system. Yet Newman was hard on him when he called "Maurician" some sermons "which seem to make subjective religion all in all". He added: "The said Maurice" is "at present the great doctor at Cambridge. What a set they are! They cannot make religion a reality; nothing more than a literature"(157). Maurice's religion was more than literature, though Newman was not wrong when he called the Catholic Church of the Cambridge group "an idea or shadow"(158). Let us say, to be more irenic, a projection.



The contribution of the Oxford Movement to the history of the idea of Catholicity in the Church of England is ambiguous. After defining Catholicity with more precision than any one before them, and after asserting the Catholicity of the English Church more loudly than had ever been done, the most influential leader abandoned the claim. It does not belong to the scope of this book to determine at what time Newman was wrong, or to investigate if perchance his two successive positions could have been reconciled in some extraordinary way. The claim to

Catholicity which Newman asserted as an Anglican eventually destroyed itself, like a thread that has been made so taut that it bursts.

Did this climax of the Anglican search for Catholicity denote, as Newman believed, a basic fallacy in the quest? Or did it, by pointing out blind alleys, prepare new ways of reasserting the principles of Anglo-Catholicism? The answer to these questions were given in the second half of the nineteenth century, when Pusey and others of the early leaders, followed by the second generation of the Oxford Movement, tried to save the Catholicity of their Church.

Chapter Eight

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM

The Church of England never was, is not now and, I trust to God, never shall be, Protestant.—John Mason Neale.

THE conversion of Newman crowned the growing differences between two tendencies in the Oxford Movement. For those who claimed simply to continue the older High-Church party, this conversion was a defection: by joining the Roman Catholic Church, Newman pushed to a consistent end the logic of the younger Oxford men, as embodied in Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*. This was naturally a great disappointment. But it could have been seen coming. And now at last the lines could be clearly drawn between Roman Catholicism and what the Oxford men considered to be English Catholicism. The Oxford Movement, however, had not been only a return to a High-Church theology. From the beginning it contained revolutionary elements. Newman had been aware of this and had done his best to slow down the revolutionary impetus that carried some of his younger followers. There is something ironical in the fact that he, who politically and socially was reactionary, should have finally bowed to a religious revolution which he had nurtured in spite of his first intentions.

Seen from the position of the radical elements of the Oxford Movement, among whom Newman's conversion had been preceded by a number of similar gestures, his final acceptance of Roman Catholic claims was not the beginning but the end of a crisis. Admittedly, a wave of conversions followed it. But Newman himself initiated the Movement away from Anglican claims only in the sense that his previous writings had anticipated this possibility: it was not sufficient to assert the basic Catholicity of Anglicanism; one had also to make this Catholicity effective.

The choice of means "to accomplish it" marked the cross-roads where the unity of the Oxford Movement broke up. Newman's conversion, by hardening conservative resistance and enthusing radical fervour, made the necessity of such a choice irreversible.

That Newman's conversion appeared under two different lights did not lift the ambiguity of the Oxford Movement. Yet it confirmed the worst fears of its adversaries. That the trend towards Rome had existed all along was now obvious, since the most important leader had himself left for Rome. The problem to be faced by those outstanding leaders who did not follow Newman concerned the possibility of disengaging the movement from this ultramontane tendency. This was eventually done, though not exactly by the remaining figures of the first generation of the Oxford Movement. The writings of Pusey or Keble after 1845 added nothing to what they had done jointly with Newman. In a way perhaps, there was no need to add anything: their continuing fidelity to Anglicanism was a factual proof that the Oxford Movement was an Anglican phenomenon. A later generation, however, will not be satisfied with this, and will attempt to bring new elements to an Anglo-Catholic interpretation of Catholicity.



Reminiscing in 1871 on the Tractarian principles, Mark Pattison (1813-84) remarked: "The new phase [i.e. of Church of England history], which began amid confusion and alarm and even cries of treason to the Church . . . has established itself in quiet acceptance in the short space of one generation over the face of England"(1). In other words, Anglo-Catholicism continued, to the point of becoming a normal, expected development of Anglican life and doctrine. This was largely due to the tenacity of Pusey, on whom the burden of leadership fell. Pusey had never been an outstanding theological writer. His influence had lain in the area of scholarship rather than creativity. He had placed his erudition at the disposal of his friends and he had strengthened their Anglo-Catholic claims by marshalling a huge apparatus of patristic evidence. His contributions to the *Tracts* had been chains of quotations, furnishing material for theological reflection

and discussion, rather than polished elaborations. His method hardly changed after 1845, although circumstances gave his pen a polemical edge that was not entirely native to his temper.

(The English Church, Pusey maintained in his first *Eirenicon* (1866), "preserves the entire faith, such as our Lord left it with the Apostles, to evangelize the world. She believes all which the undivided Church believed, as of faith"(2). This is her basic claim to Catholicity. A member of the Church of England is nurtured in the faith of the Fathers. "We could not imagine ourselves to have lived a day out of the communion of the Church of St Augustine"(3). That Anglicanism is Catholic does not now appear, as it did in the first days of Tractarianism, as a "claim": it is a statement of fact. The Church of St Augustine "has been the home of our faith, our affections, our understanding, now to grey hairs. Like God's Word, so that undivided Church of God satisfies our whole selves. There are no clouds there. In its faith we have been ever at rest"(4). Pusey does not shrink from establishing such a fact by a comparison with "Lutheranism and Calvinism" which Lutherans and Calvinists might understandably resent. "Rejection of Catholicism ends in the long run in Rationalism"(5). As he found in his life-long study of German rationalistic exegesis, Pusey is convinced that Lutheranism and Calvinism have fostered, or slipped into, rationalism, except—as he writes with amazing assurance—"where faith has been preserved by vicinity to the English Church"(6). Anglicanism has not fallen into rationalism. Searching why this has been so, Pusey concludes: "The answer is plain; on these self-same principles, because we have *not* rejected Catholicism"(7).

Catholicism, in this context, is the faith of the undivided Church, the Church of the Fathers, to which the Church of England is heir. Should there be in history an undivided Church again, Pusey is ready to submit his judgment to it as willingly as he does to the undivided Church of the past. His third *Eirenicon* (1870) formulated a clear profession of faith: "But if the whole Church, including the Greek and Anglican communions, were to define these or any other points to be *de fide*, I should hold all further enquiries to be at an end. In whatever way they should

rule any question, however contrary to my previous impressions, I should submit to it and hold it as being, by such universal consent of the whole Church, proved to be part of the Apostles' faith"(8). This understanding of the assent of faith is exactly that of Roman Catholics. The difference is only, as Pusey explains in this third *Eirenicon*, which has the form of a letter to Newman, "upon a point of fact: what are the component parts of that Church whose reception of any doctrine saves us from all further enquiry, and rules that doctrine for us; not as to the principle, whether any such power exists"(9).

Pusey believes in the Catholicism of a distant past and hopes for a similar Catholicism in the future. The difficulty, then, lies with the present. If those who affirm Catholicity differ "upon a point of fact", then Catholicity today falls short of the visibility to be expected of the true Church of Christ. In its present instance, the Catholicity of the Church is therefore a paradox. To believe in it and affirm it implies that we affirm as real something which should be, but is not, visible. But as Pusey, in its present stance, sees it, this paradox is not unique: the entire Christian faith is paradoxical and it is no more paradoxical to believe in Catholicity than to believe in any other major Christian tenet:

We believe the Church to be universal, although there are large tracts of the world which it has not reached or from which it has been driven out; we believe the Church to be holy, notwithstanding that the evil is more on the surface than the good; we believe the prophecy to have been fulfilled, "neither shall men learn war any more", although peace has been in these last days the exception among Christians; we believe our Lord's words that love is the test of His disciples, and that thereby shall they be known among men, although unlove and jealousy and self-interest and anger are far more visible. Well then may we believe that the several Churches, owning the same Lord, united to Him by the same sacraments, confessing the same faith, however their prayers may be hindered, are still one in His sight, whom all desire to receive; whom all confess; whose passion all plead before the Father; in whom alone all alike hope(10).

This long quotation points up the strength and betrays the weakness of Pusey's position. The paradoxical nature of the

Christian faith—"scandal to Jews, stumbling-block to Gentiles"—arises from its being visible only to faith. This applies to Catholicity as to other aspects of Christianity. Yet were the analogy correct between all the items listed by Pusey, Catholicity would never have existed in any meaningful sense, any more than the prophecy "neither shall men learn war any more" has ever materialized. But in such a case Pusey could not believe in "the Church of St Augustine". Catholicity cannot be only a paradox. And if it must be one in the currently divided state of Christendom, we may well wonder why its paradoxical character has not always belonged to Catholicity.

This difficulty was not unknown to Anglo-Catholics. In his sermon of 1871 where he surveyed the development of Tractarianism, Mark Pattison saw the Anglo-Catholic position "threatened by two bodies of opinion. On its right flank it encounters the mass of ultramontane opinion. Why, it is asked, if the principle of Church authority is accepted in part, is it not accepted in whole? If the Catholic Church of the fourth century was an inspired source of truth, the Catholic Church of the nineteenth century speaks in the same name and claims the same inspiration"(11). This of course is the "point of fact" on which Anglicans and Roman Catholics differ. But there is more than a point of fact at stake: how essential to the Church is Catholicity, if a point of fact clogs it?

One answer to the question consists in asserting a paradoxical claim paradoxically. Catholic is the opposite of Protestant; and, according to John Mason Neale (1818-66), one of the restorers of religious communities to Anglicanism, "what Protestants, as Protestants, protest against, that the Church of England holds . . . and what Protestants, as Protestants, hold, that the Church of England protests against. Take it which way you like, negatively or positively; and the fact is the same. Our Church has no claim to the epithet Protestant"(12). This forcefulness is admittedly marred by Neale's basic distrust of anything Protestant. This is for him "a name which pledges us to no faith but merely to the negation of all faiths"(13). By contrast, the name "catholic" is lyrically extolled:

Shall we not rather with all our hearts and souls cling to that blessed title which by its very name embraces all mankind in the arms of its love, which speaks of peace upon earth and good will to men, for which so many martyrs have rejoiced to shed their blood, for which so many confessors have toiled and have suffered,—a name which must be victorious over every enemy, a name proper to that Church which, as universal in space, is to receive the heathen for her possession; which, as universal in time, will endure as long as the world lasts, yes, and after the world shall pass away, even for ever and ever?(14).

In a way, this seems like taking refuge in poetry away from the harsh facts of life. In another, it shows deep sensitiveness to the meaning of Catholicity as universal potentiality in time and space. Whatever dilemma could follow from the “point of fact” which Newman’s conversion had highlighted, Tractarianism had restored a Christian dimension which Evangelicalism, understood by Mark Pattison, ignored:

It has its germ in the grand idea of the universality of the Church Catholic in its two sections, the Church triumphant and the Church militant, the intimate union between Christ and his people, and our incorporation by the sacraments into this eternal and indestructible society . . . The revived catholicism of the nineteenth century has its point of departure in the Christian society. Its criterion is citizenship or incorporation, which *ipso facto* conveys all spiritual privileges(15).

Between Evangelicalism, which is “the theology of sentiment”, “the unsubstantial theory of a self-interpreted Bible”(16), and Ultramontanism or belief in papal infallibility, Anglican Catholicity upholds the true “theology of authority”, the true notion of the Christian society.

★

In spite of these courageous and moving reassertions of the Catholic principle, the “point of fact” was not easily disposed of, and much of Anglo-Catholic thought in the second half of the nineteenth century searched for a way out of the dilemma created by a fact which contradicted a principle. The preface to *Lux Mundi*, an epoch-making “series of studies in the religion of the Incarnation”, edited by Charles Gore (1853–1932) in 1889, clearly explains the purpose of the Anglo-Catholic ‘new look’,

which largely came out of this volume and which eventually supplanted the older look of the early Oxford Movement.

"We have written in this volume not as 'guessers at truth' but as servants of the Catholic creed and Church, aiming only at interpreting the faith we have received"(17). Charles Gore, who wrote the preface, was extremely conscious both of Catholic continuity—or continuity with the Catholic ages of the past—and of the need for "great changes in the outlying departments of theology", necessitated by the "new needs, new points of view, new questions" of modern times. His attempt aimed, to some extent, to incorporate into Anglican thought the notion of "development" over which Newman's Anglican convictions had slipped. But while other authors, like William Palmer (18), denied the development of Christian doctrine, Gore rejected Newman's concept as too rigid: "We cannot recognize as true development of Christian doctrine a movement which means merely an intensification of a current tendency from within, a narrowing and hardening of theology by simply giving it greater definiteness or multiplying its dogmas"(19). At the basis of this lies a changing concept of Catholicity. What is at stake for Gore is the Catholicity of the Church: the Church must show "again and again her power of witnessing to the catholic capacity of her faith and life"; and in order to show this, she must draw on what is ever new and changing in the universe, "enter into the apprehension of the new social and intellectual movement of each age", "assimilate all new material", "welcome and give its place to all new knowledge", "throw herself into the sanctification of each new social order". Catholicity now is defined as the capacity of the Church to encompass all mankind. This "fundamental catholicism" is, in the words of W. J. H. Campion, one of the contributors to *Lux Mundi*, a "correspondence, not to one or another nation, but to humanity"(20). Mark Pattison had already suggested that the Church of England had the special vocation to face the questions raised by modern science and "to re-establish the synthesis of science and faith"(21). Gore's vision is that of a new Catholicity, embracing the awakening scientific, intellectual and social consciousness of modern man, a Catholicity

developing, not only out of its inner implications by drawing on its own resources, but rather out of its commitment to the forward march of mankind by incorporating all the discoveries of the modern age.

If Charles Gore's theology still belongs to the Oxford Movement—though no longer to the first generation of it—it is not simply the successor of Tractarianism. It rather stands at a meeting-point of the Oxford Movement and the theology of Frederick Denison Maurice, where these erstwhile adversaries are paradoxically reconciled. From the Tractarians Gore and his friends inherited a strong sense of the institution, of the traditional creeds, of the episcopal and sacramental order, of continuity in a God-given ecclesiastical framework, of the past. From Maurice they borrowed their concern for humanity, for the social order, for the future. But was a fusion of these two stresses possible? No doubt, Charles Gore and the other great figures that should detain us, Henry Scott Holland (1847–1918) and Darwell Stone (1859–1941), believed that it was not only possible but necessary. They trusted that they could “preserve the type of the Christian Creed and the Christian Church; for development is not innovation, is not heresy”, while they re-interpreted the faith through “some general restatement of its claim and meaning”(22), in keeping with the new requirements of the times. This was not modernism in the sense of the early twentieth century; and there is ground to think that a modernist crisis was averted, in Anglicanism, by the efforts of Gore. Nonetheless, the programme of *Lux Mundi*, which was carried out in Gore's subsequent writings, contained the germ of a major change in the concept of Catholicity. Hitherto, Catholicity as understood by High-Churchmen, from the Carolines to Pusey, had meant continuity with the past, fidelity to a structure. From now on, it will also mean, together with this, anticipation of the future. And the future in question does not result, as in Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine*, from a movement from within, which external events and pressures do no more than occasion; it comes upon us as the unexpected, free gift of the Spirit who expresses himself inside and outside the Church in sundry manners. Catholicity thus

understood implies prophecy: a Church system and a Catholic theology "together capable of laying hold upon the future, its movements, questions, temptations, advantages, discoveries: this is what we want", as Edward Stuart Talbot (1844-1934) wrote(23). With the *Lux Mundi* school, Catholicity implied an irrational element.

★

There is a conscious attempt in the writings of Charles Gore to hold together the rational structural element, the objective datum of Catholicity, and an imponderable openness upon an unknown future. The stable structure of Catholicity is constantly affirmed against "current undenominationalism"(24). As a historian, Gore sees a great number of Christian religious bodies, "but in the midst of these we discern also something incomparably more permanent and more universal—one great continuous body—the Catholic Church. There it is; none can overlook its visible existence, let us say, from the time when Christianity emerges out of the gloom of the subapostolic age down to the period of the Reformation"(25). This is "the old historical communion of Catholic Christendom, eastern and western"(26); "a society much larger and wider and older than even the English nation"(27); "a supernatural society holding all nations together on the basis of a wider fellowship"(28); "the great Christian society"(29); "a society or brotherhood which Jesus Christ Our Lord founded to bind together in one men of all classes and races and kinds"(30). To worship and teach "after the Catholic manner" is to do so "after the manner in which Christians had always believed and worshipped and taught, after the manner sanctioned in the New Testament and broadly guaranteed to the Church of England in the Book of Common Prayer"(31). In a later address Gore proposed a carefully-worded definition: "I mean by Catholicism . . . that way of regarding Christianity which would see in it not merely or primarily a doctrine of salvation to be apprehended by individuals, but the establishment of a visible society as the one divinely instituted home of the great salvation, held together not only by the inward Spirit but also by certain manifest and external institutions"(32). What these external

institutions are appears often in Gore's writings: those who accept the Catholic position "believe that Christ instituted a visible Church, and intended the apostolic succession of the Ministry to form at least one necessary link of connection in it; . . . accept the Catholic creeds and the declared mind of the Church as governing their beliefs; and . . . believe in the sacraments as celebrated by the ministry of apostolic authority in its different grades, as the covenanted channels or instruments of grace"(33). These four institutions "can claim a catholicity quite unrivalled"(34). In so far as they were embodied in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, Gore accepted it "as a bare minimum", provided it was understood to include the sacrament of confirmation(35). Yet this structure of Catholicity is not only visible; it is also spiritual. The visibility of the Church relates us to the Word made flesh. Gore was primarily a theologian of the Incarnation, whose influence was paramount in orienting modern Anglican thought towards this central mystery, to the contemplation of which it made a great contribution. Gore accordingly always connected the essential visibility of the Catholic Church with the visibility of the Incarnation. "The idea of the visible Church, the idea of the sacraments, the idea of the ministerial succession, cohere as indissoluble elements in one idea and one institution. And this idea and institution cohere in turn with the Incarnation. . . . So the visible Church is the embodiment of Christ—the extension of the Incarnation"(36). "The Church embodies the same principle as the Word made flesh, that is, the expression and communication of the spiritual and the divine through what is material and human. . . . This visible, material, human society exists to receive, to embody and to communicate a spiritual life. And this life is none other than the life of the Incarnate"(37).

Unfortunately for the smooth development of Gore's idea of Catholicity, it soon runs into "a point of fact". What Gore understands to be the Catholic society has been divided and broken into sundry and sometimes hostile parts, the "Roman Communion", the Greek Church, the Anglican Church, all of which acknowledge the principles of Catholicity and embody them to some degree. Gore explains that, in the present state of the

Church, Catholicity remains imperfect and nevertheless that this imperfection does not ruin the Catholic dimension. "I believe in One Holy Catholic Church. This visible structure of the Church is imperfect as you see it at present; imperfect in its unity, because human arrogance and impatience have brought about division; imperfect in its catholicity, because human slackness has left a large a part of the world still outside its area; imperfect in sanctity"(38). "What I believe is not the Church of England, but the one holy Catholic Church. But unfortunately this one holy Catholic Church has, as far as this world is concerned, fallen into divisions"(39). "I am profoundly aware", Gore even wrote, "that the Catholic Church has been no more faithful to its charge than the Church which was the people of Israel alone, and that it has been at times not the instrument but the antagonist of the Spirit"(40). That divisions do not destroy Catholicity is basic to Gore's thought. "She no more ceases to be one by outward divisions, than she ceases to be holy by tolerating sin, or catholic because she has so slothfully put up with two-thirds of the world remaining in heathendom"(41). At this point, Catholicity is less a fact than a hope. It no longer carries on the past but it now consists in anticipating the future, when the Catholic dimension of the Church will have been restored through a reunion of Churches. Thus Gore's theology wavers between the past and the future, between the inheritance of the saints, imperfectly preserved, and the restoration or, as he liked to call it, "reconstruction" of Catholic fullness. "Still it is this structure", he insists, "which has been given to us, in and through which to work for God. In its authorization and in its possibilities it remains divine"(42). The openness that we have noticed in Gore's concept, the irrational element is now only a "possibility". Its basis will be the past structure, through which alone we can relate ourselves to the Incarnation; but its future form is indefinite. "We cannot doubt that a really Catholic Church would not only embody those principles of doctrine and order which we commonly call catholic, but also a very large part of the spirit and many of the methods of organization and work which we identify with the Nonconformists"(43).

We may sum this up with a key-word, which marked the extent of Gore's departure from the principles of the early Oxford Movement: Catholicity in reality means comprehensiveness. St Paul, Gore tells us, "is really in his ideals, catholic or comprehensive . . . He glories in diversity"(44).

Although Gore has used the term "comprehensive" to explain "catholic", he commonly prefers another expression: "liberal catholicism". As he understands it, this sort of Catholicism corresponds to the providential vocation of the Church of England. "Anglicanism represents a combination which, if Christianity is to do its work, must exist and be amongst the most beneficent forces of catholicity in the world"(45). We may hear an echo of Maurice's Anglican messianism in these words. In the Maurice-Gore line of anticipation Anglicanism carries the wave of the future for Catholicity. It already embodies what will some day be the true, universal Catholicity, though in a local, restricted fashion. "In spite of all sins and shortcomings, there lies with us a signal opportunity and responsibility, as the home and nursing ground of a liberal catholicism"(46). "In the providence of God it [the Church of England] has a special witness to bear in the whole Catholic fellowship. The whole Church of Christ would be a poorer thing without its distinctive gifts"(47).

When he outlines what makes Catholicity liberal, Gore simply describes the genius of the Church of England, its strange "combination" of a conservative structure of a Catholic type and of a comprehensive tolerance of doctrines and points of view, its juxtaposition of a well-ordered liturgy and deep sense of piety with what others deem to be chaotic doctrinal standards. This is a "catholicism true to history and Scripture and to the ancient liberties of Christendom"(48); "a scriptural catholicism, a catholicism in which Scripture is enthroned in the highest place of controlling authority in the Church and in the most familiar places in every home and in every heart"(49). It unites the Catholic traditional structure and the Protestant principle of Scripture as the only rule of faith. The testimony of the Church in Council belongs to the inherited structure. Local Churches and individual Christians have the responsibility to form their

own conscience in matters of doctrine. As a result, there is no "living voice", no "central oracle of infallible truth". Rather, "the Church is a Catholic body witnessing to a faith once given. And the strength and security of witness lies not in centrality but in the agreement of converging and independent testimonies, which is the principle underlying the authority of General Councils"(50). One cannot "appeal to a particular moment of Christian development as having any degree of finality"(51). In all matters one should seek for the convergence of "Church authority, Bible authority and individual conscience"(52). The tension of these three principles is the driving power behind Catholicity; their agreement witnesses to continuity within development. Liberal Catholicity, then, is the flow of history through the Church; it is providential history carrying the Church to its future completion.

Basically, Gore argues from the facts of Anglican life. He then enlarges the Anglican vision of a Church which is "both catholic and reformed" to the dimensions of Christendom, all Christianity being destined to recover unity and catholicity in the comprehensiveness of Anglicanism. There follows for Anglicans the peculiar duty to behave "as if" they were truly Catholic, "as if" they already belonged to the fulfilment of liberal Catholicity: "Just in proportion as the Anglican Church has been content to act as if she were Catholic, and to stir up the gifts within her, in that proportion we find she is so and has the living spirit in her body"(53).



It is unfortunate for the historian of Anglican thought that most of Henry Scott Holland's theology was formulated in sermons. Had he expressed himself in a more systematic and leisurely way, he may well have become the most impressive theologian of the modern Anglican communion. As matters stand, sermons provided him with a medium in which he excelled, but eloquence seldom contributes to the organic march of thought which is necessary to a theological synthesis. From the insights that his works contain, however, it appears that his approach to the

concept of Catholicity, though not essentially different from that of Gore, introduces an eschatological point of view which is rather new.

For Henry Scott Holland, as for Gore and practically all modern Anglo-Catholics, the fragmentation of the Catholic Church is a "point of fact" looming above theological speculation on the nature of the Church. In the light of Providence, this fact justifies the separate existence of the Church of England. "The Church of God may be shivered in fragments, and we may find ourselves thrown by history into some strong group of believers cut off from the main body; and we must be true to our historical position, and long history cannot be undone in a moment" (54). In other words, whatever the claims of Rome, and whatever their ground, Anglicans are in duty bound to persevere in their isolated position, for they must be true to their history. This is not detrimental to the English Church, since all Churches today, whatever their size, are also separated and isolated: "Nor will we, again, because God's Church is intended to be united and complete, rush over and hide ourselves within its largest fragment, trusting that its very size may help us to forget that it is but a fragment after all" (55). The basic fact is that Catholicity is now unfulfilled. The splendid descriptions of the Church made, for instance, by St Paul, cannot apply to the visible Church of our times. The Church of the Fathers exists no longer before our eyes. Yet such a Church, which corresponds to God's intent and to Christ's institution, should exist. Thus Holland contrasts his inherited belief in a Catholic Church and the absence of such a Church today: "And all the world could see and know, in that firm and united Church of God, the evidence that God was with it. So the Catholic Church moves along the pathway of history, beautiful as an army with banners, and the cry of the King is in it. Surely so it was! We have heard it with our ears; our fathers have told us. And now! Now, nothing of the sort is to be seen—nothing but confusion, dismay, depression. If only we knew who were the heretics!" (56) We find ourselves faced with the paradox, that was already central in Charles Gore's writings, of the joint necessity and yet absence of a Catholic Church. For St Paul

"there was no miserable antithesis; for him, invisible and visible were fused, through the heat of the Holy Spirit, into one tremendous fact—the Church of God". He had "the vision of a living and integral Catholicity". But now this is impossible: "The two are no longer co-terminous, no longer co-ordinated and inveterately convolved. And we are forced to use his great language with a difference, with humiliating apologies, with heartbreaking qualifications"(57).

Henry Scott Holland's deep anguish pierces through his polished expressions. Can we rest satisfied with "confusion, dismay and depression", with "hubbub and confusion"?(58). Can we belong "to a church in difficulties, a church under a cloud, a church distracted, a church that was ignorant of the road it had to tread"?(59).

Holland's conviction is not only that we can, but that we must, remain faithful to the Church in her historical plight. The modern mind, he believes, understands that such a price has to be paid by the Church for living in history. "This all belongs to the normal plight in which the Church of God works out its destiny"(60). From the historical concerns of the nineteenth century Christians should learn, as Anglo-Catholics have, the humility of the historical condition, from which not even the Church can escape. "We say", he writes, summarizing the evolution of the later Oxford Movement, "that our choice was to be made, not between Ideal and Ideal, still less between Roman Ideal and Anglican Ideal, but between Real and Real. We had not to determine what ought to be or to have been; but we were concerned entirely with what had been, with what God had allowed to be"(61). The important point is that the Real of today should still be guided by "the idea of true catholicity"(62), that we should still perceive "the necessity for one holy Catholic Church"(63). At this point, the vision of full Catholicity still guides us. The Church must be aware of what she should be like. Holland describes it beautifully in many passages with striking insights into Catholicity:

Christendom, as the Master saw it, ought to be visibly and undeniably one thing from end to end, bounded by positive outlines,

compact, concentrated, solid. It would not lie loose, weltering, vague, inorganic; but would be upgathered into a single whole, that would move altogether when it moved at all. One heart would beat within it, one food nourish it, one brain direct it, one interest absorb it. . . . And so harmoniously formed, through it would pass unchecked the Glory of Him who made it for Himself(64).

The Christian faith postulates such a Catholicity: "Combination is of the essence of its creed, so that the faith only exists in a corporate form as a society, a kingdom, a family, and to believe at all involves belief in a Catholic Church"(65). As this implies, the Church must be supra-national and independent of all States. "This is what constitutes her catholicity. Her animating principles, her authoritative life, cannot lie within any national limits"(66).

Since Holland is well aware of the requirements of Catholicity and believes at the same time that these requirements are not now fulfilled, he will project their fulfilment, and the realization of Catholicity, into an indefinite future. The fullness of the Church, the total identity between the visible and the invisible, are eschatological events. "Until the Day of the Lord comes, the Church is still in the night, still slumbering and sleeping"(67). The beginnings of Catholicity that may be seen in the Church are only promises and anticipations; "The common inheritance of grace brought down to us by a Catholic Church—this is the beginning of salvation"(68). The Church on earth is only a prophecy, a type of the Kingdom to come. This eschatological emphasis dominates what may well be Holland's best production, *God's City and the Coming of the Kingdom*, where "the idea of the Catholic Church" is depicted working within the body of believers, making it more and more faithful to that idea, slowly bringing the visible in line with the invisible. The invisible is, ultimately, Christ himself:

Faith in Jesus is the act by which a believer passes into the Church, which is Christ's Body, Christ's New Manhood. Christ, as summing up humanity, as Himself the New Man, as Himself the Head in whom all consist, is, in Himself, a Church—the Church of the

redeemed. He gathers into Himself all things in one. He is the holy Society; His personality is its constitutive force. He is the Kingdom(69).

The coming of this Kingdom is prepared and anticipated in the visible Church, in spite of its shortcomings. Sins and weaknesses will last "until the two whom God first joined together have once more learned to cleave each to each, and inward faith in the heart and outward realization in the Body are become one thing"(70).

Caught between the united past and the unifying future, cleft in two by their faith in "a believing body, massive, concerted, catholic, carrying along with it as it goes the momentum and the heritage of an unbroken existence"(71), and the sight of the divided, uncatholic Christendom of the present, Anglicans will cherish the relics of the past: "Thank God", Holland exclaims, "the structural witness is still ours!"(72). And they will work to restore Catholicity, holding both horns of their tragic dilemma: "We can serve and love a Catholic Church which, Catholic though it be, nevertheless bears the scars of a troubled story, and has suffered, and lost, and finds it difficult to make way, and sees before her a troubled and clouded road"(73). It is still possible, Holland suggests, "that all our denominationist tendencies may yet be working out in the direction of fundamental union". This is on condition that Catholicity be not sought "by falling below differences, but by rising above them; not by undercutting them, but by retaining, absorbing, transcending them"(74). At this stage, Catholicism has outgrown the dilemma of the "point of fact" which arrested the attention of Holland's predecessors. The problem is no longer whether Catholicity resides in Rome or at Canterbury. The question has been widened to embrace all Christian denominations, and it has conjured up a new dilemma, totally distinct from the former: Is Catholicity historical or eschatological? Was the Catholic Church of the first three centuries a brief vision of "God's City", never destined to be given substance on earth again? Is the idea of Catholicity the hope against hope of a broken and divided Church on pilgrimage towards the heavenly City, dreaming of its past unity and endlessly looking forward to its future oneness, till Kingdom come?

If this change of problematic has indeed taken place, the claims of Anglican High-Churchmanship have been essentially altered.

★

The doctrine of Darwell Stone (1859-1941) is similar, with a notable difference of presentation. His works are more didactic and lack the unction of Holland's sermons. In his three major works, *Outlines of Christian Dogma* (1900), *The Church: Its Ministry and Authority* (1902), *The Christian Church* (1905), Darwell Stone takes up the notion of Catholicity, not only from the same angle, which would be normal enough, but even in the same words, thus giving the impression of copying himself.

Stone's explanations hinge on a distinction between the ideal and the minimum of Catholicity. There is no true Church without the minimum; but no Church ever reaches the ideal. Catholicity in practice wavers between them. "There is an ideal to which greater or less approximation may be made at different times; and there is a minimum below which a religious body could not sink without ceasing to be a part of the Catholic Church"(75). Darwell Stone's problematic follows the same movement as the thought of Gore and Holland: the notion of Catholicity is dominated by a pragmatic consideration which seems to become more important than the doctrine itself. He defines the ideal in properly doctrinal terms: "The ideal of the Catholicity of the Church thus includes extension throughout the whole world, and among all classes of men, the complete teaching of all the doctrines of the orthodox faith and completeness also in its dealings with sin and promotion of virtue"(76). Next we run into the supposed fact that the Church has never done all these things. There follows a pragmatic toning down of the practical requirement of Catholicity: "It is obvious that the perfect attainment of the ideal at any particular time cannot be of the essence of the Church, since, if it were, the Catholic Church would not now anywhere exist"(77). The minimum is reached when it becomes impossible to pursue the ideal in any way.

To become such that it could not appeal to the whole world or to all classes of men, to deny essential parts of the revealed faith, to

become in its accepted principles a necessary instrument of some sins or a necessary opponent of some virtues, would be, in proportion as this was wilful and deliberate and fully carried out, a sinking below the minimum which the note of Catholicity requires(78).

This attempt to carry out the implications of the new concept of Catholicity remains hesitant. For how can one decide when a Church has reached the minimum? To determine this by comparing the doctrines and standards of today with those of the past would entail the canonization of a given period as essentially Catholic. And the whole trend of the new theology is to shy away from the absolutization of any historical period. An appeal to the past should be balanced, as Darwell Stone thinks, by an appeal to the future:

The Catholic of necessity looks back to the past; for in the past is the tradition that supports his belief. But of necessity also he looks forward to the future, to the re-united Church which is to be, and he sees that the past will find its full significance in the development which has yet to come. For the Church's life is greater than that of any one century, or of any particular series of centuries; it is for all times(79).

Ideal Catholicity is waiting for us in the unknown future. The Church looks forward to it. It is a heavenly ideal for which one prays. A Church will be defined as Catholic, in this line of thought, both by her preservation of a minimal structure inherited from the past, and by her desire for fuller Catholicity, her willingness to look forward to a fulfilment which is always yet to come. The minimal structure of Catholicity is, in Anglican theology, the apostolic succession. But this does not amount to the branch-theory of the Church, as the Tractarians taught it: for all Churches may partake of Catholicity to the extent of their desire for eschatological fullness.

Thus the Anglo-Catholicism of the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century wavered between two standards of Catholicity. On the one hand is the institutional criterion: a Catholic structure has been inherited from the past. "Thank God", as Henry Scott Holland said, "the structural witness is

still ours. We are learning the peculiar significance and value of the traditional form in which it has been historically expressed" (80). The notion of apostolic succession, or, as the Lambeth Quadrilateral (1888) called it, "the historic episcopate", holds a central place in this Anglo-Catholicism, in that it focuses structural Catholicity. Referring to the *Catechism* of Bishop Pearson, Henry Barclay Swete (1837-1917), could still write in 1915: "The title 'catholic' must be vindicated for all churches that retain the great sacraments, the doctrine of the catholic creeds, and the succession of the historic episcopate; and it must be denied to bodies which, however great their spiritual efficiency, do not fulfil these necessary conditions of genuine catholicity" (81). Charles C. Grafton (1830-1912), Bishop of Fond du Lac, one of the rare Anglo-Catholic bishops of the American Episcopal Church, defended a concept of Catholicity which was all but purely institutional. Catholic Christendom, for him, is characterized by "the episcopal government of the Church, the three sacred orders of the ministry, the preserved apostolic succession through episcopal ordination, the Christian priesthood and the real presence and eucharistic sacrifice" (82). On the strength of these "gifts" the Catholic Church, in each of its divisions, is "not a dead but an authoritative and living voice. . . . She is ever proclaiming, in the midst of the world's tumultuous babel of contending utterances, the faith once for all delivered to the saints" (83).

This could have been written by some advanced Non-Jurors in the eighteenth century or by the early Tractarians. At the beginning of our century, however, this institutional concept was already outmoded in Anglo-Catholic theology. In 1920, Darwell Stone and F. W. Puller, criticizing the "Lambeth Appeal to all Christian People", could indeed protest:

The Church militant is a society consisting of all those who believe in Christ and have been validly baptized, and are in fellowship with one or other of those organized groups of Christians which possess a legitimately appointed Ministry deriving its authority through an unbroken series of successive ordinations from the Apostles, and profess the truth once for all delivered to the Saints (84).

But this insistence on a Catholicity turned to the past, through apostolic succession was somewhat at odds with Darwell Stone's minimal Catholicity turned to the future in desire and hope.

Others were aware of a growing discrepancy between the traditional notion of institutional Catholicity, restored to Anglicanism as a whole by the Oxford Movement, and a neo-Catholicity, what J. G. Simpson called "a real catholic consciousness": "Does the catholicity of the Church of England manifest itself in a real catholic consciousness? Or is it merely the usages of what we call 'the whole catholic Church' on the practice of which we choose to rest our claim?" (85). The Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, A. M. Fairbairn (1838-1912), blamed the early Oxford Movement for a narrowness of outlook incompatible with true Catholicity. "It has been nothing short of a calamity to the English Church that her claims to be catholic have been made to turn so much on the question of Orders. . . . They have pleaded that they were a Catholic Church because they had an apostolic ministry; but it was easier to argue that their ministry was apostolic than to organize Catholic unity and order" (86). Fairbairn was a Congregationalist, out of sympathy with Anglo-Catholic thought. But, objecting as he did to the institutional aspect of the Catholic claim, he did not notice how near the following remark came to the new trends of Anglo-Catholicism: "The Catholicism of the Catholic Church is large, but there is one still larger, the note and possession of no church but of all the churches, the Catholicism of the Christian religion" (87). This is not a matter of institution, but of truth and holiness. What is true and holy in one Church belongs to all Churches:

From this point of view, I claim to be, as much as any Catholic, heir to all that is of Christ in Catholicism; and the claim is not in any way affected by either absolute negation or qualified assent from the Catholic's side. Whatever is of Christ in his system can be in no respect alien to what is of Christ in me and mine. True Catholicism must be as comprehensive as the action of God (88).

This is not an Anglo-Catholic or even an Anglican voice. Yet, Congregationalist though it be, it follows the logic of a

doctrine of "ideal and minimal catholicity"; it brings to its term the concept of Catholicity as eschatological anticipation, which we have found in Charles Gore, Henry Scott Holland and Darwell Stone. Catholicity now means comprehensiveness.



If the preceding analysis is correct, Anglo-Catholic thought on the nature of Catholicity substantially changed between the heyday of the Oxford Movement and the beginning of the twentieth century. Under the impact of many theological, historical and social factors, which it is not our purpose to sort out here, the greatest figures of Anglo-Catholic theology in the last decades of the nineteenth century introduced new elements into High-Church Anglicanism, which they placed side by side with the older emphasis in an unstable synthesis. The destiny of an unstable synthesis is to break up. Whatever its intrinsic value, the theology of Maurice contradicts that of Newman, as both Maurice and Newman knew very well. Later theologians who were influenced by both attempted to unite them, with the result that Maurician antibodies in their theology tend to neutralize the Tractarian virus. The institutional emphasis on apostolic succession is reduced to a concern for "the historic episcopate", a much vaguer, less doctrinal and less structural concept. Catholicity, again in Maurician fashion, is both broadened and weakened into comprehensiveness. The artificial and at all times unsatisfactory branch-theory has made way for a theory of a Catholic-Church-in-becoming, to the development of which all who aspire to Catholicity may contribute.

Whatever else this may imply, it clearly shows that Anglo-Catholic thought has reached the age of ecumenism.

EPILOGUE

THE concept of Catholicity is central to the claim that the Church of England is and has always been the continuing Catholic Church in England or at least a form of this Catholic Church. Yet the explanations of Catholicity in Anglican theology have evolved. This seems sufficiently established by the preceding study. The doctrines of Protestant, Low-Church or Evangelical Anglicans have not detained us, except for the formative period of the Henrician and Elizabethan ages. After these beginnings, we have focused our attention on the development of thought in High-Church Anglicanism. The Caroline and Restoration divines, the Non-Jurors, the Tractarians and the initiators of modern Anglo-Catholicism did believe that the Church of England was part of the Church Catholic and that the characteristic features of Catholicity were more or less perfectly fulfilled in it.

This theology of Catholicity has evolved since the reign of Elizabeth I. In the eyes of the Elizabethan divines, Catholicity was the prerogative of a Church faithful to Holy Scripture and the tradition of the early centuries, and such a Catholicity of faith and teaching could be ascertained by doctrinal criteria. Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign, resistance to the Puritan assault introduced an institutional standard: a Catholic Church has preserved the apostolic institution of episcopacy, transmitted by imposition of hands. Doctrinal and institutional Catholicity went hand in hand in Caroline theology, in the seventeenth century. The Non-Juring schism brought matters to a crisis: Could Catholicity be maintained outside of the main body of the Church, by a small remnant loyal to the consensus of patristic doctrine and to the succession of episcopal authority? The extreme Non-Jurors asserted that they alone were the Catholic Church, the Establishment having slipped into apostasy. In spite of a widespread belief, the notion of Catholicity was not lost during the second half of the eighteenth century, at the low ebb

of Anglican theology: it was preserved by determined, if relatively uninfluential, groups of High-Churchmen.

The Oxford Movement continued the High-Church tradition by restoring the cherished convictions of the Caroline divines and the Non-Jurors to a dominant place in Anglican thought. The criterion of Catholicity remained twofold: doctrinal and institutional, patristic consensus and episcopal succession. Yet a new accent appeared. Catholicity was not only something to preserve; it was also something to accomplish. On the question of "how to accomplish it", Newman left the Church of England, ending his quest in Rome.

With Charles Gore and the main Anglo-Catholics of the latter half of the nineteenth century, the concept of Catholicity changed substantially. While the rigid positions of the Oxford Movement were faithfully maintained by many, Gore opened Anglo-Catholicism to the theology of Frederick Denison Maurice. Catholicity became, not something to accomplish, but something to manifest, varying from a minimum to an ideal never reached in this world, to be fulfilled only in the Kingdom of God.



It is not my intention to end this volume on a thorough survey of the extremely varied twentieth century. The lack of historical perspective for this unfinished period would in fairness make a selection of main currents highly arbitrary and would require more space than is available here. None the less, some aspects of the present situation call for remarks.

If the main conclusion of the last chapter is correct, a substantial change has taken place, in recent times, in the Anglo-Catholic concept of Catholicity, which now tends, under the posthumous influence of F. D. Maurice, to develop in a dialectical encounter with Protestantism. This may be normal in this ecumenical time, when the various Christian traditions challenge each other constructively in conversations across denominational boundaries. If this happens, as it does, from Church to Church, it should be all the more normal and fruitful between the several traditions coexisting in the one Anglican communion.

Yet this is not all the story of our century. For a significant event could indeed have influenced the development of the Anglo-Catholic idea in a different direction, although it did not actually do so. The Malines Conversations, from 1921 to 1927, took place between Roman Catholics and Anglo-Catholics. By virtue of the Anglican personalities selected for this experiment in dialogue (Lord Halifax, Armitage Robinson, Bishop Walter Frere, and, later, Bishop Gore and B. J. Kidd), the Roman Catholic and the Anglo-Catholic concepts of Catholicity had occasion to meet, as it were, face to face. Lord Halifax stood, more than any other, in the strict tradition of the early Oxford Movement, while Gore, although elderly and often at odds with younger men, remained the spokesman for latter-day Anglo-Catholicism.

The conversations dealt with less central matters than the concept of Catholicity. Yet a few significant allusions were made. An outline of topics used by Halifax, Frere and Robinson to prepare the first conversation noted as "fundamental" for Anglican doctrine:

Creeds, especially the two, because recited by all; Catechism, because preliminary to confirmation and first communion. To these may be added as less explicit: the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the Church and the Catholic doctors, being the test of *de fide* doctrine; the rites of the Prayer-book: *lex supplicandi*=*lex credendi*; the dogmatic decisions of the General Councils—4, 6 (or 7) in number(1).

While this offers no systematic definition, it points out the empirical requirements of Catholicity in Anglicanism, which boil down to what is implied in Anglican liturgical and catechetical practice. Holy Scripture and the Catholic doctors, in this outline, are given less importance than the more institutional elements of the Creeds and the Catechism. But this is obviously not an exhaustive theological treatment of the question; it is rather a memorandum of key-points for argumentation. Lord Halifax's own report, summarized at Malines on 6th December 1921, contained a carefully worded description of membership in the Church:

The Church would consist of those who by the gift and operation of the Holy Ghost form one body with Our Lord Jesus Christ or, to expand the idea, of those who by the profession of the Catholic Creeds and by means of the sacraments instituted by Christ, have been transferred from the parentage of the first Adam to that of the Second Adam, Our Lord Jesus Christ(2).

This implicitly defines Catholicity as man's spiritual transformation and his assumption into Christ through the traditional faith and sacraments. In his report on "unity with diversity", Gore directly approved the following summary of St Cyprian's notion of tolerance in faith: "There are certain fundamental conditions of Catholic communion, but . . . we must not extend those conditions beyond the certain warrant of Scripture"(3). Gore desires "toleration within the limits of Catholic communion"(4) on the basis of the canon of Vincent of Lérins: "universal agreement and unvarying tradition and scriptural authority"(5). On this basis, a corporate reunion may be conceivable between Rome, the Orthodox Church and the Anglican Communion.

The Anglican participants were hampered in their freedom in so far as they were expected to represent, rather than their personal positions, the broad concepts of the Anglican communion as a whole. They obviously could not go beyond the instructions of the Archbishop of Canterbury, as summed up in the latter's pastoral letter for Christmas 1923:

I have always considered it important that our representatives at Conferences which take place, whether with Free Churchmen or Orthodox or Roman Catholics, should remember that, while each individual remains free to express his own opinions, what is in question is not what any individual may think, but what the great Anglican body has in the past maintained or is likely to maintain in the future(6).

This caution was no doubt wise on the part of the Archbishop. But since it implied a broad concept of Anglican unanimity, lagging far behind the Anglo-Catholic view of Catholicity proper, it hindered the encounter that might well have taken place.

The Malines Conversations were a lost opportunity for Catholics and Anglo-Catholics to initiate a dialogue on their common claim to Catholicity. For better or for worse, opportunities for Protestant-Anglo-Catholic conversations on our topic have been more fruitful. The claim to Catholicity on the part of Protestants has been, for one thing, better asserted and explained than in the past. A volume like *The Nature of Catholicity* (London, 1941) by the Congregationalist Daniel T. Jenkins, cannot be dismissed or ignored. In response to a request from the Archbishop of Canterbury, Geoffrey Fisher, three slim volumes have appeared: *Catholicity: a Study of the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West* (London, 1947), by a group of Anglo-Catholics; *The Fulness of Christ* (London, 1950), by Evangelical Anglicans; and *The Catholicity of Protestantism* (London, 1950), by Freechurchmen.

This important exchange, which need not be studied in detail in this place, supports the view that Anglo-Catholic thought on the nature of Catholicity is now engaged in a dialogue with Protestant rather than with Roman Catholic doctrine.

What the outcome of this confrontation will be remains of course impossible to foretell. The ecumenical situation of our day makes it impossible for modern Anglo-Catholicism to return to a "branch-theory" which would exclude Protestant bodies from the Church. The greater names of Anglicanism today belong to the tradition of Charles Gore rather than to that of Pusey. Two trends have coalesced in their thought: that which makes Catholicity a doctrinal and spiritual unanimity formulated and preserved through episcopacy, and that for which Catholicity is an indefinite openness to the Providence of God manifesting itself in the future. From the former there results a concern for tradition and for the forms in which Catholic consciousness was expressed in the past. The latter provides an orientation towards the social, political, philosophical and spiritual forces that will shape the future and influence the theological situation of tomorrow.

In this newer vision, Catholicity is past, as the unanimity of the "undivided Church"; it is future, as the hoped for unanimity

of a reunited Church; and it is present in as far as present Churches are, in spite of all, related to the eschatological reality of the Body of Christ. The clearest formulation of this seems to have been made by William Nicholls:

We must both affirm the Catholicity which is derived from the participation of the churches in the eschatological reality of the Body of Christ, and deny that any of them may claim the fullness of historical Catholicity which could belong only to a united Church, possessing the fullness of Word and sacrament, the fullness of historical continuity with the Apostles, and a fullness of outgoing life. Catholicity is thus a dynamic quality, not a static possession. It is a continual pressing forward to the historical realization of that in which we participate eschatologically, that Body of Christ in which the Spirit makes us members now, into whose fullness we shall have grown up only in the Kingdom(7).

Thus caught between a world where Catholic voices from the past resound, and one where Catholic voices from the future are awaited with eager longing, modern Anglo-Catholicism is bound both to hesitate before the new forms of Christian institutional life forged in the ecumenical movement, and eventually to accept and endorse them. The self-sacrifice of parts of the Anglican Communion to ecumenical mergers cannot be welcome to the heirs of the Oxford Movement. South India is the type of such a transformation, in which the Anglican institution dies as Anglican and is reborn as "united" in communion with Protestants of various origins and contradictory traditions, in the expectation that a new kind of Catholicity will be born of the venture. Yet at this point F. D. Maurice comes into his own, and the shades of the Tractarians and the Non-Jurors retreat. Old-fashioned Catholicity gives way to comprehensiveness.

Is this a climax of the High-Church tradition, by which Anglo-Catholicism is moulding the Christianity of the future, thus ensuring continuity between a neo-Catholicism embracing the Protestant communions and the older Catholicism from before the Reformation? Or a crisis in which Anglo-Catholic thought will, little by little, merger by merger, forgo its Catholic heritage? Is it the token of a future reconciliation, the details and

circumstances of which cannot yet be foreseen? Or an omen that comprehensiveness becomes, for the concept of Catholicity, a blind alley?



That our enquiry should end in a quandary is an indication that Anglicans should not be too eager to enter mergers that may eventually jeopardize part of their doctrinal heritage, and that Protestants should not be too sanguine about the sort of unity which these unions may create. But those who belong to the older, larger and, I believe, wiser tradition of the Catholicism in communion with the See of Peter should nevertheless turn toward the Anglo-Catholicism of yesterday and today with fraternal attention. The winding history of the efforts made in the Church of England to preserve and develop a theology of Catholicity is a striking testimony to the permanence of the Catholic idea in spite of schisms and heresies. That this theology should never be fully developed fits the dynamic nature of this mark of the Church. Catholicism as a system of thought and worship evolving in a given institutional framework can be adequately described; but the underlying Catholicity, the spiritual power giving life to the system, is a mystery of participation in the fullness of him who is All in all, that may never be totally grasped and satisfactorily formulated(8).

Catholicity is not only a memory of past ages lingering in our consciousness. Yet it is partly this, and we may exclaim with His Holiness Pope John XXIII, guardian and symbol of the Catholicity with which the Lord has endowed his Church: "How beautiful is the passage of the Acts of the Apostles, where St Luke draws the first picture of the universality of the faithful, all called to the same faith on the day of Pentecost, on Mount Sion!"(9).

Catholicity is not only a hope for the future, an anticipation guiding the faithful in the darkest hours of their life. Yet that it also is, and we may confidently share the expectation of the Pontiff: "... there will appear a vision of the land of the living, which the pilgrimage of the Church militant wishes to reflect by spreading the first mysterious and ineffable echoes of the City of God in the whole world"(10).

Catholicity is essentially a reality today: "Humbly indeed, yet with a soul that has been enlarged to the dimensions of the world, we truly represent here all peoples, all races and civilizations in a wondrous harmony, that has never been experienced as it is now, of longing for union and brotherhood"(11). Through this calling of the children of God into one, may all separated Christians become "the mystical flock", "gathered from the four corners of the earth" by the Good Shepherd, sharing "one faith common to all, a common participation in the same sources of grace, the same urge to prayer, sacrifice and toil for the Lord's Name, his Kingdom and his Will!"(12).

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

- C. J. Abbey-J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vol., London, 1878.
- G. W. O. Addleshaw, *The High Church Tradition*, London, 1947.
- F. R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland*, London, 1958.
- Robert S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement, 1649-1662*, London, 1951.
- E. C. Bourne, *The Anglicanism of William Laud*, London, 1947.
- Louis Bouyer, *Newman*, Paris, 1952.
- Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival*, London, 1925.
- G. W. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian*, London, 1956.
- V. J. K. Brook, *A Life of Archbishop Parker*, Oxford, 1962.
- Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, Cambridge, 1926.
- James Carpenter, *Gore: a study in liberal Catholic Thought*, London, 1960.
- S. C. Carpenter, *Church and People, 1789-1889*, London, 1933.
- S. C. Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, London, 1959.
- Alan G. Chester, *Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English*, Philadelphia, 1954.
- Francis Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, London, 1960.
- G. R. Cragg, *The Church and the Age of Reason, 1648-1789*, London, 1960.
- F. L. Cross, *Darwell Stone*, London, 1943.
- Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, vol. III: *From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1850*, Princeton, 1961.
- Horton Davies, *Worship and Theology in England*, vol. IV: *From Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900*, Princeton, 1962.
- P. M. Dawley, *John Whitgift and the Reformation*, London, 1955.
- George E. DeMille, *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church*, Philadelphia, 1941.
- J. B. Dockery, *Christopher Davenport*, London, 1960.
- C. W. Dugmore, *The Mass and the English Reformers*, London, 1958.
- L. E. Elliott-Binns, *English Thought, 1860-1900. The Theological Aspect*, London, 1956.
- George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*, London, 1956.
- Charles George-Katherine George, *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation, 1570-1640*, Princeton, 1961.

- F. Goldie, *A Short History of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, London, 1951.
- W. Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, London, 1958.
- Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, vol. I, London, 1950.
- Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, vol. II, 1953, and III, 1954.
- W. L. Knox-A. R. Vidler, *The Development of Modern Catholicism*, London, 1933.
- T. A. Lacey, *Herbert Thorndike*, London, 1928.
- H. R. McAdoo, *The Structure of the Caroline Moral Theology*, London, 1942.
- P. E. More-F. L. Cross, *Anglicanism: The Thought and Practice of the Church of England: Illustrated from the religious literature of the seventeenth century*, London, 1935.
- Maurice Nédoncelle, *Trois Aspects du Problème Anglo-Catholique au XVII^e siècle*, Paris, 1951.
- J. H. Overton, *The English Church in the Nineteenth Century, 1800-1833*, London, 1894.
- J. H. Overton, *The Non-Jurors. Their lives, principles and writings*, London, 1902.
- J. H. Overton-Frederic Relton, *The English Church from the accession of George I to the end of the eighteenth century, 1714-1800*, London, 1906.
- A. M. Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple*, London, 1960.
- J. G. Ridley, *Nicholas Ridley*, London, 1957.
- W. Schenk, *Reginald Pole, Cardinal of England*, London, 1950.
- W. M. Southgate, *John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1962.
- V. F. Storr, *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century, 1800-1860*, London, 1913.
- Norman Sykes, *Church and State in England in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1934.
- Norman Sykes, *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, London, 1948.
- Norman Sykes, *William Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury*, Cambridge, 1957.
- Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter*, Cambridge, 1956.
- Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker, 1660-1768*, Cambridge, 1959.
- George H. Tavard, *Holy Writ or Holy Church*, London, 1959.
- A. R. Vidler, *The Theology of F. D. Maurice*, London, 1948.

- J. W. C. Wand, *The High Church Schism*, London, 1951.
Wilfred Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, London, 1889.
H. F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603*, London, 1954.

NOTES

CHAPTER I

1. Henry Gee, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, 1921 ed., pp. 145-53.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 187. 3. *Ibid.*, p. 187. 4. *Ibid.*, p. 442.
5. *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer* (Parker Society), 1846, p. 448.
6. "Examination before Brokes", l.c., p. 224.
7. J. A. Muller, *The Letters of Stephen Gardiner*, Cambridge, 1933, p. 351.
8. *An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith Touching the Most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar*, 1551, fol. 1v.
9. Quoted in J. A. Muller, *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction*, London, 1926, p. 129, from *A Detection of the Devil's Sophistry*, 1546.
10. Quoted in Muller, l.c., p. 282. 11. Quoted in Muller, l.c., p. 155.
12. This is the title of Cranmer's book: *Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*, 1550.
13. *Explication and Assertion* . . . , fol. 2-3.
14. George Burnet, *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*, Oxford, 1865, vol. 4, pp. 481-2.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 486. 16. *Ibid.*, p. 483. 17. *Ibid.*, p. 486.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 483.
19. *Annotations to the Answers to 17 Questions*, in Burnet, l.c., vol. 6, p. 244.
20. *Ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 478. 21. *Ibid.*, vol. 4, p. 481.
22. See Muller, l.c., pp. 145-6. 23. Burnet, l.c., vol. 4, p. 467.
24. See P. A. Sawada: "Two Anonymous Tudor Treatises on the General Council" (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. XII, v. 2, 1961, pp. 197-216).
25. Cranmer, *Defense of the True . . . , Remains*, vol. 2, p. 354.
26. *Ibid.*
27. *King's Order for Bringing in Popish Rituals*, 1549, in Jenkyns, *Remains*, vol. 4, p. 374.
28. *An Answer to a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner*, in Jenkyns, l.c., vol. 3, p. 53.
29. Jenkyns, l.c., vol. 2, pp. 308-9. 30. Jenkyns, l.c., vol. 3, p. 384.
31. Jenkyns, l.c., vol. 3, p. 114. 32. Henry Gee, l.c., p. 305.
33. Jenkyns, l.c., pp. 382-3.
34. *An Answer to a Crafty . . . , Jenkyns*, l.c., p. 169. 35. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
36. "The Last Examination", in *The Writings of John Bradford* (Parker Society), vol. II, 1848, p. 489.
37. *An Answer to a Crafty . . . , in Jenkyns*, l.c., vol. 3, p. 11.
38. *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum* (1640 ed.), p. 29.

CHAPTER II

1. See John Strype, *Memorials of the Reformation*, vol. VII (1816 ed.), pp. 397-413.
2. Quoted in J. E. Neale, *Elizabeth I and her Parliaments, 1559-81*, London, 1953, p. 79.
3. Quoted in J. E. Neale, l.c., p. 73.
4. *Zurich Letters* (Parker Society), vol. I, 1842, p. 33.
5. *Remains of Abp Grindal* (Parker Society), 1843, p. 214.
6. Quoted in Neale, l.c., p. 318.
7. *Declaration of Christ*, in John Hooper, *Writings*, Philadelphia, 1852, p. 71.
8. "Articles Concerning Christian Religion", 1551, in *Later Writings of Bp Hooper* (Parker Society), 1842, p. 121.
9. Quoted in Neale, l.c., p. 372.
10. *Stapleton's Fortress Overthrown* (Parker Society), 1848, p. 119.
11. *Works of John Jewel* (Parker Society), 1845-50, vol. 4, p. 789.
12. *Apology for the Church of England*, in *Works*, vol. 3, p. 100.

13. *Works*, vol. 4, p. 667.
14. Robert Crowley, *Brief Discourse Concerning Those four Usual Notes*, 1581 (no page numbers).
15. Haddon, *Against Jerome Osorius an Answer Apologetical*, 1581, fol. 63r.
16. *Ibid.*, fol. 57r.
17. Fulke, *A Rejoinder to Bristow's Reply*, 1581, in *Works* (Parker Society), vol. II, 1848, p. 130.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 132.
19. *Confessio Augustana*, ch. 7.
20. *L'Institution Chrétienne*, bk. 4, ch. 1, v. 9 (Labor et Fides ed.), vol. 4, 1958, p. 21.
21. John Jewel, *Defense of the Apology*, 1567, *Works*, vol. 4, p. 668.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 959.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 675.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 974-5.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 903 ff.
26. For a discussion of this point, see H. F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603*, New York, 1954, pp. 59-106.
27. In *Gualterum Haddonem libri tres*, 1567, p. 189.
28. *L.c.*, vol. 3, pp. 351, 353, 356-7, 373, etc. . . .
29. *L.c.*, vol. 4, p. 715.
30. Harding, *Rejoinder to Mr Jewel's reply*, 1566, fol. 61-2.
31. Strype, *The Life of Abp Whitgift*, vol. II, Oxford, 1822, p. 52; see *Annals of the Reformation*, vol. III, part II, Oxford 1824, p. 100.
32. *Defensio Tractationis de diversis gradibus, contra responsionem Bezae*, 1594, prologue (no page numbers).
33. *De diversis gradibus ministrorum evangelii*, 1590; English translation: *A Treatise on the different degrees of the Christian priesthood*, Oxford, 1840, p. 223.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 199.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 144.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 118.
37. *Ibid.*, p. 237.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 275.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 252.
40. *Responsio ad Guetzerum Jesuitam*, in *Diversi Tractatus Theologici*, London, 1611 (no page numbers).
41. See n. 31.
42. *The Perpetual Government of Christ's Church*, 1593, preface (no page numbers).
43. Strype, *The Life of Abp Whitgift*, vol. II, Oxford, 1822, p. 170.
44. *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. III, ch. XI, v. 16 (Everyman's ed., vol. I, p. 353).
45. *Ibid.*, bk. VII, ch. IV-V, in *The Works of Mr Richard Hooker* (John Keble, ed.), vol. III, Oxford 1845, pp. 151-68.
46. William Fulke, *Defence of the Sincere and True Translation of the Holy Scripture* (1583); Parker Society, 1843, ch. 15, p. 461.
47. *A Confutation of the Rhemish New Testament*, 1 Tim. 8, ed. New York, 1834, p. 296. This should not be confused with Thomas Cartwright, *A Confutation of the Rhemists' Translations, Glosses and Annotations on the New Testament*, 1618. In *Elizabethan Recusant Prose* (London, 1950, p. 456), A. C. Southern omits to mention Fulke's *Confutation*.
48. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, 1593, p. 393.
49. *Certain Slanderous Speeches against the Present Estate of the Church of England*, in *Albert Peel, Tracts ascribed to Richard Bancroft*, Cambridge, 1953, p. 132.
50. *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. I, ch. VIII, n. 8, *l.c.*, pp. 181-2.
51. *Ibid.*, preface, ch. VI, n. 6, *l.c.*, pp. 121-2.
52. *Ibid.*, ch. VI, n. 1, p. 117.
53. *L.c.*, bk I, ch. XIV, n. 2, p. 216.
54. *L.c.*, bk IV, ch. IX, n. 3, p. 389.
55. *L.c.*, bk IV, ch. IX, n. 2, p. 389.
56. *L.c.*, bk IV, ch. VIII, n. 2, p. 385.
57. *L.c.*, bk IV, ch. VIII, n. 4, p. 387.
58. *L.c.*, preface, ch. VIII, n. 7, pp. 134-5.
59. *L.c.*, bk IV, ch. IX, n. 1, p. 388.
60. *Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline*, pp. 73, 75.

CHAPTER III

1. *Plea of the Innocents*, quoted in E. C. E. Bourne, *The Anglicanism of William Laud*, London, 1947, p. 2.
2. *A Treatise of the Holy Catholic Faith and Church*, in *Works* (LACT), Oxford, 1844, vol. XII, p. 161.
3. *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (LACT), 1847, p. 16.
4. *Responsio ad Card. Bellarmini Apologiam*, 1610, (LACT), 1851, p. 218.
5. *Practical Catechism*, in *Works* (LACT), vol. 1, 1849, p. 329.

6. *A Plain but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England* (LACT), 1842, p. 58.
7. Isaac Barrow, *An Exposition of the Creed*, in *Theological Works* (A. Napier, ed.) vol. 7, Cambridge, 1859, p. 345.
8. *Essays in Divinity*, ed. Evelyn M. Simpson, Oxford, 1952, p. 48.
9. *Of the Church*, 1604, ed. Oxford, 1835, vol. 1, p. 87.
10. "Sermon 13", in *Sermons of John Donne*, ed. Simpson-Potter, vol. 2, Berkeley (Calif.) 1955, p. 280.
11. *Just Vindication of the Church of England from the Unjust Aspersions of Criminal Schism*, 1654, in *Works* (LACT), vol. 1, p. 103.
12. *Discourse on the Liberty of Prophesying*, in *Works*, vol. 2, London, 1835, p. 325.
13. *Conference with Mr Fisher the Jesuit*, 1639 (LACT), vol. 2, 1849, p. 104.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 77.
15. Nicholson, l.c., p. 60.
16. Jackson, l.c., p. 169.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 169-70.
18. *Discourse concerning the Church*, ed. 1638, p. 8.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
20. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 24-5.
22. *Dissuasive from Popery*, in *The Whole Works of the Rt Rev Jeremy Taylor*, l.c., vol. 2, p. 837.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Discourse on the Liberty of Prophesying*, l.c., p. 349.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 334.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 364.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 365.
29. *Dissuasive from Popery*, l.c., p. 838.
30. Bramhall, *Answer to M. de la Milletière*, in *Works* (LACT), vol. 1, p. 43.
31. *Vindication of himself and the episcopal clergy from the presbyterian charge of Popery*, in *Works* (LACT), vol. 2, p. 521.
32. *Reply to S. W.'s Refutation*, l.c., p. 314.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 315.
34. *Just Vindication . . .*, l.c., p. 110.
35. Geoffrey Sodon, *Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester, 1583-1656*, London, 1953, pp. 464-5; see J. B. Dockery, *Christopher Davenport*, London, 1960, pp. 55-61.
36. *A Gag for the New Gospel?* 1624, preface (no page numbers).
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 40-1.
38. *Schism Guarded* (LACT), vol. 2, p. 597.
39. L.c., p. 174.
40. *A Just Appeal from two Unjust Informers*, 1625, p. 126.
41. *Of the Church*, bk III, pp. 340-1.
42. *Ibid.*, bk V, p. 565.
43. Laud, l.c., p. 98.
44. *Ibid.*, p. 99.
45. Lancelot Andrewes, *Responsio ad Card. Bellarmini Apologiam*, p. 216.
46. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
47. Hammond, *Paroensis* (LACT), vol. 2, pp. 333-4.
48. Bramhall, *Vindication . . .* vol. II, p. 531.
49. Henry Hammond, *Practical Catechism*, *Works*, vol. I, p. 329.
50. Richard Crakanthorpe, *Defensio Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (LACT), p. 158.
51. Bramhall, *Just Vindication . . .*, p. 104.
52. Casaubon: *Anglican Catholicity vindicated against Roman Innovations*, with "Confession of Faith of King James I", ed. W. R. Whittingham and Hall Harrison, Baltimore, 1875, p. 10.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
54. Field, *Of the Church*, bk. I, p. 89.
55. Bramhall, *Schism Guarded*, p. 596.
56. *Ibid.*, p. 595.
57. Bramhall, *Replication . . .*, p. 60.
58. Jeremy Taylor, *Of the Sacred Order and Office of Episcopacy*, *Works*, vol. II, London, 1847, p. 249.
59. *Answer to ch. XVIII of Cardinal du Perron's Reply*, in *Works* (LACT), vol. XI, p. 29.
60. *Schism Guarded*, p. 591.
61. Andrewes, l.c., p. 19.
62. Andrewes, *Responsio . . .*, p. 262. According to Isaac Casaubon, King James I does not "reject the words of the Fathers, as transmutation, alteration, transelementation and such like, if they be understood and expounded agreeably to their intention". (l.c., p. 25).
63. *Vindication of the Church of England*, *Works* (LACT), 1827, vol. 2, p. 255.
64. Jackson, l.c., p. 157.
65. Bramhall, *Just Vindication*, p. 113.
66. Casaubon, l.c., pp. 6-7.
67. Bramhall, *Replication*, p. 55.
68. Bramhall, *Answer to M. de la Milletière*, p. 43; *Just Vindication*, p. 101; *Schism Guarded*, p. 599.
69. Crakanthorpe, l.c., p. 9.
70. Sanderson, l.c., p. 17.

71. Jackson, l.c., p. 164. 72. Montague, *Just Appeal* . . . 1625, p. 113.
 73. Casaubon, l.c., p. 33. 74. *Schism Guarded*, p. 551.
 75. *Historical Vindication of the Church of England*, Cambridge, 1847, p. 239.
 76. *Schism Guarded*, p. 591.
 77. Taylor, *Of the Sacred Order and Office of Episcopacy*, p. 235.—In *Just Vindication*, p. 112, Bramhall lists the formal causes of schism. The last, "wilfully break the line of apostolic succession, which is the very nerves and sinews of ecclesiastical unity and communion", does not apply to Rome.
 78. Thomas Jackson, l.c., p. 163. 79. *Just Vindication* . . . , p. 104.
 80. Ibid., p. 100. 81. *Answer to M. de la Milletière*, p. 81.
 82. *Just Appeal* . . . 1625, p. 113. 83. *Conference with Mr Fisher*, pp. 346-7.
 84. *Essays in Divinity*, l.c., p. 50.
 85. *Convocation Book* (LACT), 1844, pp. 127-8. 86. l.c., p. xiii.
 87. *The History of the Troubles and Trial of William Laud*, in *Works*, vol. III, p. 415.
 88. Casaubon, l.c., p. 19. 89. *Conference* . . . , p. 417.
 90. l.c., p. 162. 91. *Responsio* . . . , p. 25. 92. Ibid., p. 39.
 93. Field, l.c., p. 84. 94. Bramhall, *Schism Guarded*, p. 591.
 95. Montague, *Acts and Monuments*, 1642, p. 71.
 96. See R. S. Bosher, *The Making of the Restoration Settlement*, London, 1951, p. 5.
 97. *Schism Guarded*, p. 591.

CHAPTER IV

1. *The Due Way of Composing the Differences on Foot, Preserving The Church*, 1660, *Works* (LACT), vol. V, 1854, p. 48.
 2. Ibid., p. 60. 3. Ibid., p. 65.
 4. *Just Weights and Measures*, *Works*, vol. V, p. 274.
 5. *The Due Way* . . . , p. 66. 6. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 75.
 7. *Just Weights* . . . , ch. I, § 2-4, l.c., pp. 76-8.
 8. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 210; also Chapter 1, 5, 7; *The Reformation* . . . , ch. 12-15; *Epilogue* . . . , bk. III, ch. 31; compare: "The service of God according to Christianity sanctifies all times, all places, all gestures, all circumstances, that can pretend to express, to procure, to advance, that attention of mind, that devotion of spirit, wherewith Christians profess to worship God in spirit and truth" (*Just Weights* . . . , p. 79).
 9. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 116. 10. Ibid., p. 124.
 11. *Epilogue to the Tragedy of the Church of England*, 1659, bk. III, pt. II, *Works*, vol. IV, p. 916.
 12. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 97.
 13. *The Plea of Weakness and Tender Consciences Discussed and Answered*, 1667-8, *Works*, vol. V, p. 367.
 14. *The Rights of the Church in a Christian State*, *Works*, vol. I, p. 575.
 15. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 121.
 16. *Epilogue* . . . , bk. III, ch. XI, in *Works*, vol. IV, p. 259.
 17. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 278.
 18. *The Reformation of the Church of England better than that of the Council of Trent*, 1670-72, ch. XLIV, in *Works*, vol. V.
 19. *Just Weights* . . . , ch. VIII, § 1; XXI, § 1; *Epilogue* . . . , bk. I, ch. IV; bk. II, ch. XXI, §§ 3-4; XXVII, §§ 9-26.
 20. *Just Weights* . . . , ch. VII, § 3. 21. Ibid., ch. II, § 3.
 22. Ibid., ch. III, § 8, p. 95. See also: *Due Way* . . . § 6; *A Discourse of the Forbearance of the Penalties which a due Reformation Requires*, 1670, ch. 30; *The True Principle of Comprehension*, 1667, n. XI; *Epilogue* . . . , bk. III, conclusion, § 24.
 23. *Just Weights* . . . , ch. III, § 9, p. 95. 24. Ibid., ch. VII, § 6, p. 125.
 25. Ibid., ch. XXI, § 3, p. 223. 26. *The Reformation* . . . , p. 494.
 27. *The Reformation* . . . , p. 491. See *Just Weights* . . . , ch. IV, § 5.
 28. *Epilogue* . . . , p. 102; See ch. VII, § 36; *The Reformation*, ch. 1, § 2.
 29. *Epilogue* . . . , bk. I, ch. XII, § 1, p. 217.
 30. Ibid., bk. I, ch. XVI, § 11; XVIII, §§ 38-40.
 31. *The Reformation* . . . , p. 493. 32. Ibid., ch. V, § 2.
 33. *Just Weights* . . . , ch. XXV, § 3-5. 34. *The Reformation* . . . , p. 498.
 35. *Epilogue* . . . , bk. I, ch. VIII, § 9, pp. 145-6.

36. *The True Principle* . . . , p. 322. 37. *Ibid.*, p. 319.
 38. *Just Weights* . . . , p. 122. 39. *Ibid.*, ch. VII, § 3.
 40. *Ibid.*, p. 116. 41. *Ibid.*, p. 117.
 42. *Epilogue* . . . , conclusion, § 22, p. 906.
 43. *Ibid.*, p. 905. 44. *Ibid.*, p. 932. 45. *The Plea* . . . , p. 360.
 46. George Bull, *Judicium Ecclesiae Catholicae*, 1695, *Works* (LACT), vol. 3, pp. 2-3.
 47. *Ibid.*, p. xiii. 48. *Ibid.*, p. 129.
 49. *Two Discourses against the Romanists*, 1676, p. xiii, Disc. I, p. 8.
 50. *Two Letters of Advice to Theological Students*, 1672, 3rd ed. 1691, p. 130.
 51. *Two Discourses* . . . , Disc. I, p. 20. 52. *Two Letters* . . . , p. 39.
 53. *Two Discourses* . . . , Disc. II, p. 26.
 54. *Separations of Churches from Episcopal Government proved Schismatical*, 1679, preface, p. xix.
 55. *Ibid.*, p. 483. 56. *Ibid.*, p. 594. 57. *Ibid.*, p. 548.
 58. *Two Discourses* . . . , Disc. I, p. 6. 59. *Ibid.*, p. 8. 60. *Ibid.*, p. 6.
 61. *Ibid.*, Disc. II, pp. 21-2; see *Two Letters* . . . , p. 28.
 62. *Separations* . . . , p. 688. 63. *Two Letters* . . . , p. 247.
 64. *Discourse Concerning the One Altar and One Priesthood*, 1683, sect. 8.
 65. *Doctrine of the Church of England Concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay-Power as to those Rights of theirs which are Purely Spiritual, Reconciled with our Oath of Supremacy and the Lay Deprivations of the Popish Bishops in the Beginning of the Reformation*, 1697, p. 1.
 66. See Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors*, 1924, pp. 349-51.
 67. *Doctrine* . . . , p. 30. 68. *Ibid.*, p. 33. 69. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
 70. *Ibid.*, p. 20. 71. *Ibid.*, p. 19. 72. *Ibid.*, p. 32.
 73. *Ibid.*, p. 19. 74. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
 75. *Ibid.*, §§ 27-8; 35. 76. *Ibid.*, §§ 31-2.
 77. *De Nupero Schismate Anglicano Paraenesis ad Exteros Tam Reformatos quam etiam Pontificios*, 1704, n. 33, p. 153.
 78. *Ibid.*, n. 33, p. 159. 79. *Ibid.*, n. 34, p. 159. 80. *Ibid.*, n. 34, p. 165.
 81. *Ibid.* 82. *Ibid.*, n. 12, p. 52. 83. *Ibid.*, n. 33, p. 153.
 84. *A Case in View*, 1704, p. 39.
 85. *Vindication of the Deprived Bishops*, 1692, p. 28.
 86. *Occasional Communion, fundamentally destructive of the discipline of the primitive Catholic Church and contrary to the doctrine of the latest Scriptures concerning Church Communion*, 1705, p. 75.
 87. *A Case in View*, p. 37. 88. *Ibid.* 89. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
 90. *Occasional Communion* . . . , p. 195. 91. *Vindication* . . . , p. 17.
 92. *Occasional Communion* . . . , p. 9. 93. *Ibid.*, p. 201.
 94. *Vindication* . . . , p. 31. 95. *Occasional Communion* . . . , p. 115.
 96. *Ibid.*, p. 181. 97. *Ibid.*, p. 201. 98. *Ibid.*, p. 105.
 99. *Ibid.*, p. 149. 100. *Ibid.*, p. 152.
 101. *De Nupero Schismate* . . . , p. 176. 102. *Occasional Communion* . . . , p. 200.
 103. *Ibid.*, p. 203. 104. *Ibid.* 105. *Ibid.*, p. 206.
 106. *The Nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ*, a sermon preached before George I on 31st March 1717. This sermon sparked a violent controversy in which more than fifty writers exchanged blows.
 107. *The True Principle of Comprehension*, *Works*, vol. V, p. 341.
 108. *The Plea of Weakness* . . . , *Works*, vol. V, p. 380.

CHAPTER V

1. *The Essay Toward a Proposal for Catholic Communion . . . Answered*, 1705.
 2. H. N. Oxenham (ed.), *An Eirenicon of the Eighteenth Century*, London, 1879, p. 117.
 3. W. Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, London, 1958, pp. 53-4.
 4. *L.c.*, p. 54. 5. *Ibid.*, p. 315.
 6. *Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Non-Jurors both in Church and State*. This was a refutation of Hickes' posthumous work, *The Constitution of the Christian Church* (1716).

7. *Sermon of Nov. 5, 1709*, printed London, 1710, p. 16.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 19. 9. *Ibid.*, p. 22.
10. *The Christian Priesthood asserted*, 1707, in, *On the Christian Priesthood*, 4th ed., Oxford (LACT), 1847, vol. 2, p. 234.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 235. 12. *Ibid.*
13. Charles Leslie: *The Case stated between the Churches of Rome and England*, 1713, in *Works*, Oxford, 1832, vol. 3, p. 174.
14. Hickeys: *Prefatory Discourse in answer to: The Rights of a Christian Church asserted*, l.c., vol. I, p. 281.
15. *Ibid.*, p. 320. 16. *Ibid.*, p. 272.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 278. 18. *Ibid.*, p. 273.
19. Leslie, *The true notion of the Catholic Church*, 1703, l.c., vol. 3, p. 230.
20. Hickeys, *Prefatory Discourse . . .*, p. 274.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 294. 22. *Ibid.*, p. 295.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 298. 24. *Ibid.*, p. 279.
25. *Letter to the author of a book falsely entitled, The Rights of a Christian Church asserted*, in l.c., vol. I, p. 56.
26. Thomas Brett, *Tradition necessary to explain and interpret the Holy Scripture*, 1718, p. 41.
27. Leslie, *True Notion . . .*, p. 246.
28. *A Vindication of the Postscript*, 1720, p. 129.
29. *An Account of Church Government*, 1710, ch. I, pp. 1-22.
30. *Tradition Necessary . . .*, p. 52. 31. *Ibid.*, pp. 51-2. 32. *Ibid.*, p. 51.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 1-5. 34. *Ibid.*, p. 49. 35. *Ibid.*, p. 64.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 45. 37. *Ibid.*, pp. 101-2. 38. *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 101.
39. "Proposals" of 18th August 1716, in Mansi, *Collectio Conciliorum*, vol. 37, col. 384.
40. "Answer of the Patriarchs", 18th April 1718, l.c., col. 408.
41. "Proposals", l.c., col. 386; and "Answer", col. 418.
42. "Letter to the Metropolitan of Thebais", 30th May 1722, l.c., col. 521; "Letter to the Holy Synod", 13th July 1724, l.c., col. 582.
43. "Letter of Abp Wake to the Patriarch of Jerusalem", 6th Sept. 1725, l.c., col. 593.
44. Quoted in Henry Broxap: *A Biography of Thomas Deacon*, Manchester, 1911, p. 116.
45. *The Doctrine of the Church of Rome Concerning Purgatory Proved Contrary to Catholic Tradition*, 1718, p. 140.
46. *Ibid.* 47. *Ibid.*, p. 142.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 141. 49. *Ibid.*, p. xxvi.
50. Quoted in Henry Broxap: *The Later Non-Jurors*, Cambridge, 1924, p. 66.
51. "Letter to Thomas Brett", in Henry Broxap, l.c., p. 129.
52. The extraordinary title of this work points to Deacon's thoroughness: *A full, true and comprehensive View of Christianity, containing a short historical account of religion from the creation of the world to the fourth century after our Lord Jesus Christ, as also the complete duty of a Christian in relation to faith, practice, worship and rituals, set forth sincerely, without regard to any modern church, sect or party, as it is taught in the Holy Scriptures, was delivered by the apostles and received by the universal Church of Christ during the four first centuries; the whole succinctly and fully laid down in two catechisms, a short and a longer, each divided into two parts; whereof the one comprehends the sacred history and the other the Christian doctrine; the shorter catechism being suited to the meanest capacity and calculated for the use of children, and the longer for that of the more knowing Christian; to which is prefixed a discourse upon the design of these catechisms and upon the best method of instructing youth in them.* London, 1747.
53. *Comprehensive View, Shorter Catechism*, pt. II, lesson VII, p. 47.
54. *Idem, Longer Catechism*, pt. II, lesson IX, p. 162. 55. *Ibid.*
56. *Three Letters to the Bishop of Bangor*, "Letter 2", in *Works*, vol. I, London, 1892, p. 77.
57. *Ibid.*, p. 74. 58. L.c., "Letter 3", p. 105. 59. *Ibid.*, p. 158.
60. *Letters to a Lady inclined to enter the Church of Rome*, "Letter 3", in *Works*, vol. 7, p. 251.
61. *Ibid.* 62. Op. cit., "Letter 1", p. 223. 63. *Ibid.*
64. *Ibid.*, p. 224. 65. *Ibid.* 66. *Ibid.*, p. 232.
67. *Works*, vol. 7, p. 95.
68. "Letter", 28th Feb. 1756, l.c., vol. 7, p. 110.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 114. 70. *Ibid.*, p. 115. 71. *Ibid.*, p. 119.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 116. 73. *Ibid.*, p. 119.

74. "Letter VI" (no date), l.c., vol. 7, p. 160. 75. Ibid.
76. "Letter XI", l.c., p. 185. 77. "Letter II", 10th April 1756, l.c., p. 127.
78. "Letters to Beauvoir", "Letter XVIII", quoted in Norman Sykes: *William Wake, Abp of Canterbury*, Cambridge, 1957, vol. 1, p. 267.
79. Ibid., p. 297. 80. Ibid.
81. "Letter to Turretini", 22nd July 1719, l.c., p. 302.
82. Sermon of 31st March 1717, on "The nature of the Kingdom or Church of Christ", 1717 ed., p. 17.
83. "Letter to William King, Abp of Dublin", 10th Dec. 1719, in Sykes, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 164.
84. "Letter to Turretini", 5th Dec. 1720, in Sykes, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 19.
85. H. and C. Schneider, *Samuel Johnson, his career and writings*, 1929, vol. 3, p. 520, New York.
86. Daniel Waterland, *The Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, in *Works*, Oxford (Clarendon Press), 1823-8, vol. 5, p. 123.
87. L.c., p. 130.
88. Thomas Wilson, *Memoranda*, in *Works* (LACT) vol. IV, p. 41.
89. L.c., vol. VII, p. 209.
90. *Instructions to the clergy*, l.c., vol. VII, p. 52.
91. *Liturgical Offices*, l.c., vol. VII, p. 124.
92. *A further Instruction for those that have learned the Church Catechism*, l.c., vol. IV, p. 37.
93. *Instructions to the clergy*, l.c., vol. VII, p. 21.
94. *Fragments on the 39 articles*, l.c., vol. VII, p. 189.
95. *Notes on the Bible*, l.c., vol. VI, p. 706.
96. *Private Thoughts*, l.c., vol. VII, p. 118.
97. Quoted in John Keble: *Life of Bishop Wilson*, l.c., vol. I, p. 840.
98. Thomas Rattray: *An Essay on the Nature of the Church*, 1728, in *Works*, p. 157.
99. L.c., p. 164. 100. L.c., p. 165. 101. L.c., p. 188.
102. L.c., p. 178. 103. L.c., p. 188. 104. L.c., pp. 170-2.
105. L.c., p. 170. 106. L.c., p. 171.
107. L.c., p. 172. 108. L.c., p. 173.

CHAPTER VI

1. John Kirkby, l.c., London, 1745, p. 5.
2. Op. cit., p. 40. 3. Op. cit., pp. 29-30. 4. Op. cit., p. 12.
5. John Todd, *John Wesley and the Catholic Church*, London, 1958.
6. *The Early Evangelicals*, 1953.
7. F. R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, London, 1958.
8. S. C. Carpenter, *Eighteenth Century Church and People*, London, 1959.
9. W. Jardine Grisbrooke, *Anglican Liturgies of the 17th and 18th centuries*, London, 1958.
10. William Jones, *Life of Dr Horne*, 1795, preface to 2nd ed., in *Theological and Miscellaneous Works*, vol. 6, p. 19.
11. Ibid., p. 18. 12. Ibid. 13. Ibid., p. 15.
14. Ibid., p. 13. 15. Ibid., p. 16. 16. Ibid., p. 14.
17. *The Trinitarian Analogy*, 1792, l.c., vol. 1, p. 219.
18. *An Apology for certain gentlemen in the University of Oxford*, in *The Works of the Rt Rev. G. Horne*, vol. 4, London, 1809, p. 186.
19. Ibid., p. 221.
20. *Charge to the Clergy of Norwich*, l.c., vol. 4, p. 528. 21. Ibid.
22. *Consideration on the Life of Noah*, l.c., vol. 4, pp. 154 and 156.
23. *On the Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures*, 1786, l.c., vol. 3, pp. 74-5.
24. *Letters on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Letter 3, p. 249.
25. *On the figurative . . .*, l.c., p. 182.
26. *Letters on The Epistle to the Hebrews*, l.c., p. 249.
27. Quoted in William Jones, *Life of Dr Horne*, l.c., p. 70, footnote.
28. William Jones: *An Essay on the Church*, l.c., vol. 5, p. 33.
29. Ibid., p. 28.
30. Horne, *An Apology for . . .*, l.c., p. 166.
31. Ibid., p. 167. 32. Ibid., p. 208.

33. Jones, *An Essay on Confirmation*, l.c., vol. 2, p. 381.
34. Samuel Horsley: *Charge to the Clergy*, 1784, in *Tracts in Controversy*, Dundee, 1812, p. 6.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 31.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 73.
37. *Letters from the Archdeacon of St Alban's*, l.c., p. 318.
38. *Charge to the Clergy*, l.c., p. 56.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 73; *Remarks on Dr Priestley's second letter to the Archdeacon of St Alban's*, l.c., p. 445.
41. Horsley, *Letters from . . .* p. 318.
42. *An Apology for the liturgy and clergy of the Church of England*, 1790, p. 62.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 61-2.
44. Jones, *An Essay on the Church*, l.c., vol. 5, pp. 28-9.
45. Jones, *The Churchman's Catechism*, l.c., vol. 5, p. 427.
46. Horsley, *Sermon on the text of Matthew 16: 18-19*, in *Sermons*, vol. 2, Dundee, 1810, p. 329.
47. Jones, *Letter to Three Converted Jews*, 1799, l.c., vol. 6, p. 212.
48. *Ibid.*, p. 71.
49. "Calvin was undoubtedly a good man and a great divine: but with all his great talents and his great learning, he was, by his want of taste and by the poverty of his imagination, a most wretched expositor of the prophecies, just as he would have been a wretched expositor of any secular poet" (*Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 67).
50. Horsley, *Remarks on Priestley's . . .*, l.c., p. 445. See Horne: "Popery may be bad, but irreligion is not better" (*Letters on Infidelity*, letter 5, p. 388).
51. Horsley, *Letters from the Archdeacon . . .*, l.c., p. 314.
52. Jones, *Essay on the Church*, l.c., p. 52.
53. Horsley, *Sermon on Mt 16: 18-19*, in *Sermons*, vol. 2, p. 332.
54. Jones, *A Letter to the Church of England*, l.c., vol. 6, p. 238.
55. Horne, *Apology for certain gentlemen . . .* l.c., pp. 166-7.
56. Horne, *Considerations on the life and death of St John the Baptist*, l.c., vol. 4, p. 264.
57. Stevens, *Cursory Observations . . .* 1773, in Οὐδένος ἔργα, no date, p. 32.
58. Horsley, *Apology for the liturgy . . .*, 1790, l.c., p. 76.
59. Horsley, *Letters from the Archdeacon . . .*, l.c., p. 313.
60. Jones, *Essay on the Church*, l.c., vol. 5, p. 54.
61. Stevens, l.c., p. 32.
62. Horne, *Discourse on Christian Unity*, l.c., vol. 3, p. 221.
63. *Ibid.*
64. Horne, *Considerations on the life . . .* l.c., p. 190.
65. Horsley, *Charge to the clergy . . .*, l.c., p. 82.
66. Horne, *Apology for certain gentlemen . . .*, l.c., p. 190.
67. Thomas Wilson, *Works* (LACT), vol. VII, p. 114.
68. Philip Skelton, *An appeal to common sense on the subject of Christianity*, in *Works*, 1824, vol. 6, p. 96.
69. Skelton, *Discourse LXIV*, l.c., vol. 3, p. 257.
70. *Discourse LXXI*, l.c., vol. 3, p. 356.
71. *An Appeal . . .*, l.c., vol. 6, p. 96.
72. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
73. *Sermon XXXIV*, in *Works*, 1825, vol. 3, p. 553.
74. *Lectures on the Catechism*, l.c., *Works*, vol. 6, p. 139.
75. *Ibid.*, p. 140.
76. *Ibid.*
77. *A familiar exposition of the Church Catechism*, Dublin 1777, p. 20.
78. Thomas Wilson, *Terms used in Scripture, which every minister of Christ ought to understand*, in *Works*, vol. VII, p. 167.
79. See ch. V, n. 85.
80. Pococke, *Peace on earth, good will towards men*, in *Some essays on the divine Covenants, demonstrating the necessity of sacraments and episcopal church government*, London, p. 61.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
82. *Ibid.*, pp. 99-100.
83. Thomas Sikes, *A discourse on parochial communion*, 1812, ch. 7, p. 357.
84. *Ibid.*, p. 367.
85. Jones, *An answer to an Essay on Spirit*, 1753, l.c., vol. I, p. 286.
86. *Charge delivered to the clergy of the Diocese of Lichfield and Coventry at the Bishop's primary visitation in 1775 and 1776*, London, 1776, p. 5.
87. *Elements of Christian Theology*, 2nd ed., London, 1799, pp. 323-4.
88. *Ibid.*, p. 324.
89. *Ibid.*
90. *Ibid.*, p. 325.

91. *A course of lectures delivered to candidates for Holy Orders*, ed. by Thomas Randolph, 1870, p. 222.
92. *Ibid.*, p. 232.
93. Philanthropos (perhaps George Blaikie), *A vindication of the Licensed Chapels in Scotland*, Edinburgh 1749, p. 17.
94. *Ibid.*, p. 18. 95. *Ibid.*, p. 19. 96. *Ibid.*, p. 29.
97. *Ibid.* 98. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
99. *To the author of a printed paper called, A letter from a student*, 1758, p. 6. The full title of the latter is: *A letter from a student of physick in Edinburgh to his friend in England*, 11th March 1758.
100. *To the Rev. M. R. L.*, Crail, 26th Oct. 1758, p. 3.
101. Innes, *To the Rev. Mr A. R.* 4th March 1760, in *An Answer against all the papers that have been written against the bishops of Scotland since the year 1743, in a letter to a friend*, p. 22.
102. *Ibid.*, p. 9. 103. *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12. 104. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
105. *The nature and constitution of the Christian Church*, 1750, p. 11.
106. L.c., p. 11. This passage copies, with minor alterations, a text of Thomas Rattray: *An essay on the nature of the Church*, 1728, in *Works*, p. 173.
107. *Ibid.*, p. 10. 108. *Ibid.*, p. 8.
109. *Ibid.*, p. 18. 110. *Ibid.*, p. 27.
111. *A letter to Norman Sievright, M.A.*, in vindication of the Episcopal clergy of Scotland from his charge of innovation in politics and religion, Aberdeen, 1768, p. 86.
112. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
113. *A layman's account of his faith and practice as a member of the Episcopal Church in Scotland*, 1801 (anonymous; possibly by this John Skinner), p. 20.
114. John Skinner, *A letter from an old friend to the Congregation of the Chapel at Old Deer*, 1798, p. 9. The *Life of John Skinner* (in the *Theological Works of John Skinner, Dean of Aberdeen*, vol. 1, Aberdeen, 1809) attributes this pamphlet to Dean John Skinner (1721-1807), not to Bishop John Skinner (1744?-1816).
115. *A layman's account . . .*, p. 6. 116. *Ibid.*, p. 17.
117. *A letter from an old friend . . .*, p. 10.
118. *Letters to candidates for Holy Orders*, Letter XXIII, in *Theological Works of John Skinner, Dean of Aberdeen*, vol. 1, p. 452.
119. Bishop John Skinner, *A Catechism*, 1786, in *A Course of Lectures delivered on the six Sundays in Lent*, p. 184.
120. *Charge at the Second Visitation of the Diocese of Rochester*, 1800, in *The Charges of Samuel Horsley*, Dundee, 1813, p. 129.
121. *Ibid.*, p. 137.
122. *A letter to Lord North, chancellor of the University of Oxford, concerning subscription to the 39 articles*, 1781 (anonymous), p. 2.
123. *A letter to Josiah Tucker*, p. 29.
124. *Letter to the clergy of the Archdeaconry of Winchester*, 1773, p. 13.
125. *A vindication of the Church of England in requiring subscription to the 39 articles*, 1773, p. 41.
126. *Charge to the Clergy of the diocese of Oxford*, 1771 (2nd ed.), p. 18.
127. *Treatise on . . .*, p. III. John Potter (1674-1747) was Archbishop of Canterbury; his *Discourse concerning Church Government* was published in 1707.
128. Charles Daubeny, *Lectures on the Church catechism*, Bath, 1788, p. 98.
129. Daubeny, *A Guide to the Church*, London 1798, Discourse 2, pp. 34-5.
130. *Ibid.*, p. 35. 131. *Ibid.*, p. 37. 132. L.c., Discourse 10, p. 209.
133. *Appendix to the guide to the Church*, 1799, vol. 2, letter 8, p. 464.
134. L.c., vol. 1, letter 2, p. 129. 135. *Ibid.*, pp. 129-130.
136. *A guide . . .*, disc. 3, p. 54.
137. *An Appendix . . .*, vol. 2, letter 8, p. 425. 138. *Ibid.*, pp. 425-6.
139. *Guide to . . .* disc. 9, p. 149-50.
140. *A letter to a Scottish nobleman*, 1800, printed as an appendix to John Skinner: *A layman's account of his faith and practice*, 1801, p. 177-8.
141. Thomas Sikes, *A discourse on parochial communion*, 1812, ch. I, p. 56.
142. *Ibid.*, p. 9. 143. *Ibid.*, p. 18. 144. *Ibid.*
145. *Ibid.*, ch. 2, p. 88. 146. *Ibid.*, ch. 1, p. 18.

147. *Ibid.*, ch. 4, p. 185, footnote.

148. Newman was born in 1801. Charles Daubeney's *Guide to the Church* is from 1798.

CHAPTER VII

1. *Reflections* . . . , p. 28. 2. *Ibid.* 3. L.c., pp. 12-13.
4. L.c., p. 28. 5. L.c., p. 29. 6. L.c., p. 30.
7. L.c., preface, p. v. 8. L.c., preface, p. vii.
9. "Second Letter to John S. Harford" (25th Sept. 1816), in *Remains of Alexander Knox*, vol. 3, London, 1837, p. 292.
10. L.c., p. 360.
11. *Sermons on subjects chiefly practical*, 2nd ed., London, 1816, Appendix, p. 373.
12. L.c., p. 360. 13. L.c., p. 378. 14. L.c., p. 379.
15. *Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Limerick at the primary visitation of the Cathedral Church of St Mary*, 19th June 1823, in *Practical Theology*, vol. I, London, 1830, p. 368.
16. L.c., p. 385. 17. *Ibid.* 18. *Sermons* . . . , Appendix, p. 381.
19. *Ibid.* 20. *Ibid.* 21. L.c., p. 392.
22. *Letter to the Rev. James Dunn on the impossibility of union between the Churches of England and of Rome*, in *Remains* . . . , vol. 3, p. 326.
23. *A vindication of the principles of the authors of the "Tracts for the Times"*, London, 1841, pp. 25-6.
24. *A Narrative of events connected with the publication of the "Tracts for the Times"*, 1843, p. 76.
25. *A letter to Richard, Bishop of Oxford*, 2nd ed. Oxford, 1839, p. 38.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 181.
27. Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional*, Oxford, 1847. The sermon on "primitive tradition recognized in Holy Scripture" (pp. 173-231) was preached at Winchester Cathedral, on 27th September 1836.
28. Yngve Brilioth, *The Anglican Revival: studies in the Oxford Movement*, London, 1933. The dynamic elements of Tractarianism are suitably stressed by Owen Chadwick: *The Mind of the Oxford Movement*, London, 1960.
29. Newman, "Sermon on the Communion of Saints", *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, vol. 4, London, 1868, p. 175.
30. *Tract 15* (by Newman using material collected by William Palmer, of Worcester), in *Tracts for the Times*, vol. 1, New York, 1839, p. 92. On the authorship of the *Tracts*, see Samuel Hale, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, London, 1906, pp. 140-8.
31. *The Churchman's manual*, 9.5 and 6, in *A Collection of papers connected with the theological movement of 1833*, London, 1842, p. 52.
32. *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, London, 1838, vol. 1, p. 148.
33. *Tracts*, vol. 1, New York, 1839, p. 14.
34. *Parochial* . . . , vol. 2, p. 80.
35. *The prophetic office of the church*, in *Via Media*, vol. I, London, 1901, p. 50.
36. L.c., p. 132. 37. *Tracts*, vol. 3 (new ed., 1840), pp. 27-8.
38. *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. II, London, 1898, p. 356.
39. *Tract 89* (by Keble), vol. 6, Oxford, 1868, p. 182.
40. *Sermons on subjects of the day*, London, 1869, Sermon VI, p. 73.
41. L.c., Sermon IX, p. 118. 42. *Tract 78*, vol. 4, p. 2.
43. Pusey, *A letter to His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury*, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1842, p. 70.
44. Newman, *Letters and Correspondence*, vol. II, p. 81.
45. "Letter to Margaret . . .", in *Via Media*, vol. II, London, 1899, p. 218.
46. *Prophetic* . . . , p. 212.
47. *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches vindicated against the objections of Dr Weiseman in the Dublin Review*, London, 1840, p. 187.
48. *Letter to Margaret*, l.c., p. 206.
49. *The Articles treated in Tract 90 reconsidered in a letter to Rev. R. W. Jelf, canon of Christ Church*, Oxford, 1841, p. 183.
50. *Letters*, vol. II, p. 318.
51. Pusey, *Letter to His Grace, the Archbishop of Canterbury*, p. 70.
52. Pusey, *The Articles* . . . , p. 71, note 9.

53. *Prophetical office* . . . , p. 192.
54. *University Sermons*, New York, 1872, Sermon XIV, p. 310.
55. *Sermons on subjects of the Day*, Sermon X, pp. 131-2.
56. *A letter to His grace* . . . , p. 34. 57. *A Collection of Papers* . . . , p. 2.
58. *Tract 38* (1834), in *Via Media*, vol. 2, p. 28.
59. *Prophetical* . . . , p. 212.
60. *Tract 36*, in *Tracts for the Times*, vol. I, New York, 1839, p. 266.
61. *Tract 81*, l.c., vol. 4, p. 41.
62. *The Authoritative Teaching of the Church*, Bampton lectures for 1838, Oxford, 1839, p. VII.
63. 3rd ed., London, 1846.
64. Benjamin Onderdonk, *Christian Unity*, New York, 1840, p. 9.
65. *Tract 89*, in l.c., vol. 6, Oxford, 1868, p. 182.
66. *The Divine Economy of the Church*, p. 46.
67. *A Letter to Richard* . . . , pp. 235-6. 68. *Tract 58*, in l.c., vol. 3, p. 408.
69. "The Church Visible and Invisible", in *Parochial* . . . , vol. 3, London, 1869, p. 222.
70. *Tract 41*, l.c., vol. 1, p. 305. 71. Woodgate, l.c., p. 375.
72. *Prophetical Office* . . . , l.c., p. 25. 73. *Ibid.*, p. 41. 74. *Ibid.*, p. 90.
75. *Remains of the late Rev. R. Hurrell Froude*, vol. 2, 1839, p. 274.
76. *Remains* . . . , preface to part 2, vol. 1, p. xi. 77. *Ibid.*, p. xiii.
78. *The Ideal of a Christian Church*, 2nd ed., Dec. 1844, p. 266.
79. *Letter to a Protestant Catholic*, Oxford, 1842, p. 14.
80. "Palmer's view of faith and unity", in Newman: *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. I, new ed. 1897, p. 194.
81. Ward: "Dr Weiseman's Lectures on the Catholic Church", in *The British Critic*, vol. XX, 1836, p. 402.
82. *The Ideal* . . . , p. 60. 83. L.c., p. 45, footnote.
84. *Remains* . . . , preface, p. xi. 85. *Ibid.*, p. xiii.
86. *Ibid.* 87. Palmer, l.c., p. 17. 88. *Ibid.*, p. 33.
89. *The Unity of the Church*, London, 1842, p. 155.
90. L.c., p. 156. 91. L.c., p. 156. 92. L.c., pp. 156-7.
93. L.c., p. 223. 94. L.c., p. 230. 95. L.c., p. 232.
96. L.c., p. 264. 97. L.c., p. 223. 98. Ward, l.c., pp. 292-3.
99. *A narrative of events* . . . , pp. 61 ff.
100. "Palmer on Protestantism", in *The British Critic*, 1842, p. 504.
101. "Dr Weiseman's Lectures on the Catholic Church", l.c., p. 383.
102. *The Ideal* . . . , l.c., p. 84.
103. L.c., p. 268. 104. L.c., p. 460. 105. L.c., p. 490.
106. L.c., p. 511. 107. L.c., p. 136. 108. L.c., p. 585.
109. "How to accomplish it", in *Discussions and Arguments*, new ed., 1899, p. 21.
110. L.c., p. 6. 111. L.c., p. 5. 112. L.c., p. 8.
113. L.c., p. 35. 114. L.c., pp. 18-19. 115. L.c., p. 19.
116. L.c., pp. 12-13. 117. L.c., p. 22.
118. L.c., pp. 23-4. 119. L.c., p. 43.
120. See "Note on Essay X", *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. 2, new ed., 1897, p. 75 ff.
121. "The Catholicity of the Anglican Church", *Essays Critical and Historical*, vol. 2, p. 6.
122. L.c., p. 10. 123. L.c., p. 50. 124. L.c., p. 3.
125. L.c., p. 36. 126. L.c., p. 20. 127. L.c., p. 17.
128. L.c., p. 70. 129. *Letters*, vol. 2, 335.
130. L.c., p. 384. 131. L.c., p. 404.
132. *Essays on the errors of Romanism*, 3rd series, 2nd ed., London, 1837, p. 361.
133. *The Kingdom of Christ*, 1st ed., 1838; I quote from the 2nd ed., 1842, as re-edited by Alec Vidler, London, 1958.
134. L.c., vol. I, p. 12. 135. 2nd ed., 1842.
136. L.c., Appendix, pp. 101-2.
137. *The Kingdom of Christ*, preface, vol. I, p. 18.
138. L.c., vol. II, p. 266. 139. L.c., vol. II, p. 17.
140. L.c., vol. II, p. 31. 141. L.c., vol. II, p. 54.
142. L.c., vol. II, p. 146. 143. *Three Letters* . . . , p. 75.

144. L.c., p. 103. 145. *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. II, p. 340.
 146. L.c., vol. II, p. 285. 147. *Three Letters . . .*, p. 6.
 148. *The Kingdom of Christ*, vol. II, p. 333.
 149. *Theological Essays*, re-edited New York, 1957, p. 276.
 150. L.c., vol. II, p. 300. 151. L.c., vol. II, p. 328. 152. Ibid.
 153. *Theological Essays*, pp. 276-7. 154. *Three Letters . . .*, p. 8.
 155. *The Kingdom of Christ*, "Appendix", vol. II, p. 363.
 156. *Theological Essays*, p. 275.
 157. "Letter to Keble", 23rd Dec. 1838, in *Letters*, vol. II, p. 246.
 158. Ibid.

CHAPTER VIII

1. *University Sermons*, London, 1885, sermon VIII, p. 196.
 2. *An Eirenicon* (I), 1866, p. 244.
 3. Op. cit., p. 269. 4. Op. cit., pp. 269-70. 5. Op. cit., p. 266.
 6. Ibid. 7. Ibid. 8. *An Eirenicon* (III), 1870, p. 4.
 9. Ibid. 10. *An Eirenicon* (I), pp. 68-9. 11. Op. cit., p. 208.
 12. *The Bible, and the Bible only, the religion of Protestants*, 1852, 2nd ed., London, p. 15.
 13. Op. cit., p. 10. 14. Op. cit., pp. 30-1. 15. Op. cit., p. 197.
 16. Op. cit., p. 208. 17. *Lux Mundi*, 1889, p. viii.
 18. *Doctrine of Development and Conscience considered in relation to the Evidences of Christianity and of the Catholic System*, London, 1846.
 19. *Lux Mundi*, p. viii. 20. Op. cit., p. 338.
 21. *University Sermons*, p. 214. 22. *Lux Mundi*, p. viii.
 23. Quoted in Alec Vidler, *The Church in an Age of Revolution*, 1961, p. 191.
 24. *The Mission of the Church*, 1892, p. 16.
 25. *The Church and the Ministry*, 1888, ed. 1919, p. 9.
 26. *Orders and Unity*, 1909, p. 1.
 27. "General Lines of Church Reform", in Gore, ed.: *Essays in Aid of a Reform of the Church*, 1898, p. 4.
 28. *The Religion of the Church*, Milwaukee, 1917, p. 158.
 29. *The Creed of the Christian*, 1895, p. 74.
 30. *The Religion of the Church*, l.c., p. 1.
 31. "General Lines of Church Reform", op. cit., p. 4.
 32. *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*, 1922, p. 1.
 33. *Roman Catholic Claims* (1st ed. 1888), 4th ed. 1892, p. ix.
 34. *Orders and Unity*, p. 75.
 35. *The basis of Anglican fellowship in Faith and Organization*, 1914, p. 35.
 36. *The Religion of the Church*, p. 158.
 37. *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, London, 1891, pp. 237-8.
 38. *The Mission of the Church*, p. 27.
 39. *The Religion of the Church*, p. 151.
 40. *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*, p. 8.
 41. *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 29.
 42. *The Mission of the Church*, p. 27.
 43. *Dominant Ideas and Corrective Principles*, 1918, p. 35.
 44. *Orders and Unity*, p. 212. 45. *The Mission of the Church*, p. 27.
 46. *Orders and Unity*, p. 200. 47. *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*, p. 48.
 48. *The Religion of the Church*, p. 154.
 49. *Catholicism and Roman Catholicism*, p. 48.
 50. *The Test of Theological and Ecclesiastical Development*, London, 1905, p. 30.
 51. Op. cit., p. 33. 52. *The Creed of the Christian*, p. 66.
 53. *Roman Catholic Claims*, p. 18.
 54. *Creed and Character*, New York, 1887, p. 80.
 55. *On Behalf of Belief*, 2nd ed., London, 1892, p. 140.
 56. *Vital Values*, no date, p. 74.
 57. *God's City and The Coming of the Kingdom*, London, 2nd ed. 1897, p. 47.
 58. "The Nineteenth Century", in Gore, ed.; *Our Place in Christendom*, 1915, p. 164.
 59. Op. cit., p. 156. 60. Ibid. 61. Ibid., p. 157.
 62. *Creeds and Critics*, 1918, p. 79.

63. "The Nineteenth Century", op. cit., p. 164.
64. *On Behalf of Belief*, pp. 129-30.
65. *A Lent in London*, London, 1895, H. S. Holland, ed., p. 234.
66. "Church and State", in Gore, ed., *Essays in Aid of a Reform of the Church*, p. 109.
67. *Logic and Life*, New York, 1882, p. 316.
68. Op. cit., p. 319.
69. *God's City and the Coming of the Kingdom*, p. 21.
70. Op. cit., p. 48.
71. Op. cit., p. 164.
72. "The Nineteenth Century", op. cit., p. 164.
73. Op. cit., p. 167.
74. *Creeds and Critics*, p. 79.
75. *Outlines of Christian Dogma*, 1900 (ed. 1919, p. 116).
76. *The Church: its ministry and authority*, 1902, p. 59.
77. Ibid.
78. Ibid.
79. *The Faith of an English Catholic*, 1926, p. 22.
80. "The Nineteenth Century", op. cit., p. 164.
81. *The Holy Catholic Church: The Communion of Saints. A Study in the Apostles' Creed*, London, 1915, p. 41.
82. *Christian and Catholic*, 1905, in *Works*, vol. I, p. 144.
83. Op. cit., pp. 145-6.
84. Darwell Stone and F. W. Puller, *Who are Members of the Church?* London, 1920 (ed. American Church Publication, New York, 1959, p. 25).
85. *The Conception of the Church*, London, 1915, p. 68.
86. *Catholicism, Roman and Anglican*, 1899, pp. xix-xx.
87. Op. cit., p. 193.
88. Ibid.

EPILOGUE

1. Walter Frere, *Recollections of Malines*, London, 1935, p. 65.
2. Lord Halifax, *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-25*, London, 1930, p. 72.
3. Walter Frere, l.c., p. 111.
4. Walter Frere, l.c., p. 112.
5. Walter Frere, l.c., p. 118.
6. Walter Frere, l.c., p. 86.
7. *Ecumenism and Catholicity*, London, 1952, p. 106.
8. See Pius XII, "Discourse to the International Congress of Historical Sciences", 7th Sept. 1955.
9. "Sermon for the Feast of Corpus Christi", 21st June 1962; text in *La Documentation Catholique*, n. 1380, col. 898.
10. L.c., col. 900.
11. L.c., col. 898.
12. L.c., col. 899.

INDEX

- Andrewes, Lancelot 57, 61, 66
 Anglo-Catholicism 37-42, 114, 148, 172,
 180-4, 192, 197 f, 200, 202-6
 Anne, Queen 71, 98, 115, 118, 123
 Antichrist 10, 15, 73, 141
 Apostolicity 171
 Apostolic succession 83, 138 f, 150, 158,
 161
 Articles of Religion 30, 85, 110, 116, 140
 Atterbury, Francis 98
Augsburg Confession 12, 23, 30

 Bancroft, Richard 33, 37 f, 43
 Baxter, Richard 82
 Bellarmine, Cardinal 66
 Bilson, Thomas 33, 36
Bishops' Book 5 f, 10
 Blackburne, John 110
 Boehme, Jacob 112
 Bolton, F. R. 122
Book of Common Prayer 7, 19, 22 f, 25,
 103 f, 141, 187
 Bossuet 101
 Bowden, J. W. 172
 Bramhall, John 48, 53 f, 58-67
 Branch-theory 143-5, 147, 156-9, 170,
 172, 205
 Brett, Thomas 103-7, 110
 Bridges, John 33
 Broad-Church, *see* Latitudinarians
 Bucer 122
 Bull, George 61, 80
 Butler, Joseph 94

 Calvin 9, 22, 24, 29, 72, 106
 Calvinism 181
 Cambridge Platonists 46
 Campbell, Archibald 108, 110
 Campion, W. J. H. 185
 Carpenter, S. C. 122, 124
 Cartwright, Thomas 25 f
 Casaubon, Isaac 59, 62 f, 65
 Catholicity 5, 7 f, 14 f, 20 f, 24-30, 33,
 38-42, 47-59, 64, 71 f, 75, 77-83, 86-97,
 104 f, 109-111, 117 f, 128-37, 143,
 150-7, 160, 164-74, 181-9, 196-9,
 205-7
 Charles I 45
 Charles II 69
 Chrysanthos of Jerusalem 108
 Church (Orthodox) 95, 103, 106-8
 Church (Reformed) 92
 Church of Bohemia 72
 Church of Rome 35, 40, 42, 55, 57,
 61-4, 70, 73, 82, 85, 93, 96, 101-3, 109,
 112 f, 118, 129, 136, 149 f, 168, 170-6,
 182
 Church (Doctrine of the) 30, 34, 38, 58,
 71, 77, 112, 119, 121, 126 f, 143, 161,
 174 ff, 204
 Church and State 5
 Church as Society 77 f, 88, 90, 127, 187
 Church-membership 133, 203 f
 Collegiality 83, 102
 Collier, Jeremy 104, 108
 Comprehensiveness 80, 190 f, 199 f, 206 f
 Conciliarism 1, 4, 35, 58
 Convocation 92, 98
 Convocation Controversy 98
 Copeland, W. J. 142
 Council of Chalcedon 151
 Council of Trent 56
 Councils 55 f, 58, 76, 78, 149, 191, 203
 Counter-Reformation 95
 Covenant 77, 93
 Crakanthorpe, Richard 47, 58, 62
 Cranmer, Thomas 3-21, 22, 25 f, 32, 37,
 42, 67, 84 f.
 Cromwell, Thomas 10
 Cyprian, St 88

 Dalgairns, J. D. 169
 Daubeny, Charles 142, 145
 Dawson, Benjamin 142
 Deacon, Thomas 108-11
 Development of doctrine 47 f, 162, 170,
 185
 Dissenters 81, 93, 140 f
 Dodwell, Henry 71, 81-93, 100
 Donne, John 48, 65
 Du Perron, Cardinal 61

 Ecumenism 202, 205
 Edward VI 7, 12 f, 27, 68, 85 f
 Elizabeth, Queen 3, 22-43, 84 f, 201
 Elliott-Binns, L. E. 122
 Episcopacy (Theories on) 58 f, 77
 Episcopal authority 90 f
 Episcopal structure of the Church 77, 79,
 82, 90, 93, 101 f, 116, 128, 133 f, 143,
 145, 161, 165
 Episcopal succession 77, 79, 101, 112
 Eschatology 131, 152, 154, 160, 165,
 192-95, 206

- Eucharistic doctrine 8 f, 15-20, 23, 61, 73
 Evangelicalism 95, 122 f, 146, 173, 184
- Faber, F. W. 169
 Fairbairn, A. M. 199
 Field, Richard 48, 56 f, 59, 66
 Fisher, Geoffrey 205
 Frere, Walter 203
 Froude, Hurrell 163 f
 Fulke, William 28 ff, 37 f
 Fundamentals 90
- Gardiner, Stephen 6-20, 24, 67
 George I 98, 111
 George III 123
 Goodman, Godfrey 54 f
 Gore, Charles 184-91, 202-5
 Grafton, Charles 198
 Granvella, Bishop 6
 Grindal, Edmund 26 f
- Hackney Phalanx 142, 146, 148
 Haddon, Walter 29
 Hadrian, Emperor 87
 Halifax, Lord 203
 Hammond, Henry 57 f
 Harding, Thomas 28 f, 32
 Hardy, Samuel 142
 Hawes, Samuel 104
 Hegesippus 87
 Henry VIII 1-21, 23, 68, 74, 85
 Herbert, Lord 46
 Hickes, George 100-3, 119
 High Church 49, 66-9, 71, 81, 92, 95, 102, 115 f, 118, 122-5, 130, 132, 140-2, 146, 159, 169 ff, 173, 179, 186
 Hoadley, Benjamin 91 f, 98, 111, 116
 Holland, Henry Scott 186, 191-5
 Holy Scripture 8, 15, 39 f, 42, 56, 79, 106, 126, 160
 Hooker, Richard 36, 39-43
 Hooper, John 9, 12 f, 27
 Horne, George 126-31
 Horsley, Samuel 128-31, 141
 Hurd, Richard 135
 Hutchinson, John 125
 Hutchinsonians 125-31, 135, 139, 146, 149
- Ignatius of Antioch, St 86 f, 102
 Infallibility 52-5, 76 f, 81, 117, 128, 184
 Innes, George 138 f
 Intercommunion 92
- Jackson, Thomas 47, 50, 56, 61 f, 66
 Jacobites 95, 124
 James I 45 f, 62 f, 65
 James II 69 f, 100
 Jebb, Bishop John 150
 Jebb, John (of East Farleigh) 159 f
- Jenkins, Daniel 205
 Jewel, John 25, 28 ff, 37, 42
 John XXIII 207
 John Fisher, St 6
 Johnson, Samuel 117, 134
 Jones, William 125 f, 129 f
- Keble, John 153, 158, 160 f, 166, 169, 180
 Ken, Thomas 70
 Kidd, B. J. 203
King's Book 4 f
 Kirk of Scotland 137
 Kirkby, John 121 f
 Knollys, Francis 33, 36
 Knox, Alexander 150
- Lambeth Quadrilateral 39, 188, 198
 Latitudinarians 42, 95, 123, 136, 141 f, 146, 173
 Laud, William 46, 49-57, 64-6
 Law, William 111-5
 Lawrence, Roger 110
 Lee, Edward 11
 Leslie, Charles 100-3
 Liberal Catholicism 190
 Liturgy 104, 107 f, 123, 127
 Low Church 71, 91 f, 98 f, 115, 118, 135
 Luther 1, 29, 72
 Lutheranism 181
Lux Mundi 184-7
- Malines Conversations 203
 Mann, Isaac 133
 Manning, Henry Edward 165
 Mary, Queen 3, 14-9, 26
 Maurice, F. D. 148, 173-7, 186, 190, 200, 202, 206
 Methodism 95, 122, 146 f
 Montague, Richard 55 f, 59, 62, 64, 66
 More, Thomas 1
 Mozley, J. B. 172
- National Churches 129, 139, 163
 Natural law 41 f
 Neale, John Mason 183
 Newman, John Henry 142, 147 f, 155-73, 177-80, 200, 202
 Nicholls, William 206
 Nicholson, William 47
 Nixon, Francis Russel 159
 Non-jurors 70 f, 84, 88, 92, 94-115, 121-3, 149, 157, 201
 Norris, H. H. 142
- Oakeley, F. 169
 Occasional communion 89, 91 f
 Onderdonk, Benjamin 159
 Orders 10-4, 27, 30, 32, 34-8, 86, 108, 116, 134
 Orders (Presbyterian) 60, 80

- Osorio, Jerome 32
 Overall, John 65
 Oxford Movement 124, 147-83, 199, 202
 Palmer, William (of Magdalen College) 163 f, 169
 Palmer, William (of Worcester College) 153-6, 164, 172, 185
 Papacy 73, 77 f, 136
 Papists, *see* Church of Rome
 Pattison, Mark 180, 183-5
 Pearson, Bishop 132, 198
 Perceval, Arthur Philip 153 f, 158 f
 Peter Martyr 122
 Philanthropos 136
 Pilgrimage of Grace 6
 Pococke, Richard 134
 Presbyterianism 32 f, 35, 38, 60, 67, 81, 101, 135, 138 f
 Pretymann Tomline, George 135
 Primacy 73 f, 77 f, 136
 Primacy of Jerusalem 88, 107
 Protestantism 51 f, 91, 93-5, 175, 183
 Puller, F. W. 198
 Puritans 22-8, 31, 36 f, 39-44, 67, 77
 Pusey, E. B. 153-7, 160, 164, 167, 178-83
 Queen Anne 71, 98, 115, 118, 123
 Queen Elizabeth 3, 22-43, 84 f, 201
 Queen Mary 3, 14-9, 26
 Randolph, John 136
 Randolph, Thomas 142
 Rattray, Thomas 119 f
 Recusants 23, 28 f, 45, 81 f, 89
 Reformation in England 74 f, 85, 93, 106, 163 f
 Robinson, Armitage 203
 Roman Catholicism, *see* Church of Rome
 Rose, Hugh James 148
 Royal Supremacy 3 f, 6, 12-4, 22, 31, 33, 46, 84
 Rule of faith 56 f
 Sacheverell, Henry 99 f
 Sacraments, validity of 88 f, 114
 St Cyprian 88
 St Ignatius of Antioch 86 f, 102
 St John Fisher 6
 St Vincent of Lérins 204
 Sancroft, William 70, 100
 Sanderson, Robert 51, 62
 Saravia, Hadrian 33-6, 38
 Schism 54, 62 f, 70, 76-8, 84, 89, 112, 134 f, 146
 Secker, Thomas 133
 Sects 78, 130, 175
 Skelton, Philip 132
 Skinner, Bishop John 140
 Skinner, Dean John 139
 Sikes, Thomas 134 f, 142, 145 f
 Simpson, J. G. 199
 Smith, George 104
 Spinckes, Nathaniel 96 f, 103
 Stevens, Edward 97
 Stevens, William 130, 142
 Stone, Darwell 186, 196-200
 Sutcliffe, Matthew 33
 Swete, Henry Barclay 198
 Sykes, Norman 124
 Talbot, Edward Stuart 187
 Taylor, Jeremy 49-54, 59, 63, 66
 Thorndike, Herbert 71-80, 85, 93
 Toryism 118, 123 f
 Tractarianism, *see* Oxford Movement
Tracts for the Times 155, 160-4, 180
 Tradition 34, 40, 42, 49, 52, 55-7, 60, 79, 81, 106, 109, 128, 139, 151, 153
 Transubstantiation 16-20, 24, 29, 61
 Trinity (Doctrine of the) 88
 Turretini 116
 Twysden, Roger 63
 Ultramontaniam 184
 Unity 74, 78, 81 f, 114, 130, 134-8, 144 f, 152, 165-75
 Usages Controversy 103, 109, 139
 Validity of sacraments 88 f, 114
 Vestiarian Controversy 24 ff
Via media 41 f, 65, 151
 Vincent of Lérins, St 204
 Wake, William 94 f, 108, 116-8
 Warburton, William 135
 Ward, William 163 f
 Waterland, Daniel 94, 117
 Watson, John James 142
 Watson, Joshua 142
 Wesley, John 122, 141
 Whately, Richard 173
 Whigs 95, 115, 123 f
 White, John 22
 Whitgift, John 36
 William of Orange 70, 84
 Wilson, Thomas 117, 132, 134
 Wix, Samuel 149
 Woodgate, Henry Arthur 159
 Word of God 26, 31, 34, 38
 Zwingli 9, 24, 29

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

23915